Leo Tolstoy, the Didache, and the Reinvention of Primitive Christianity: Nonviolence, Christian Anarchism, and the Crisis of Church Authority

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

June 19, 2026

Leo Tolstoy's religious thought is often reduced to a moralized Christianity centered on the Sermon on the Mount, nonresistance to evil, and rejection of ecclesiastical dogma. Yet his engagement with the Didache complicates that familiar portrait. By translating, revising, and popularizing one of the earliest surviving Christian manuals, Tolstoy placed his reforming theology in direct conversation with primitive Christian ethics, communal discipline, worship, and eschatological expectation. This paper examines how Tolstoy appropriated the Didache as evidence for a Christianity of practice while minimizing or reinterpreting features that resisted his rationalist program, including sacramental life, Trinitarian baptism, church office, and apocalyptic hope. It argues that Tolstoy's theology is best understood neither as a simple return to early Christianity nor as a purely modern ethical reduction of the gospel, but as a selective reconstruction of Christian origins for a radical moral and political purpose. The study therefore situates Tolstoy at the intersection of biblical interpretation, patristic reception, Christian anarchism, nonviolence, ecclesiology, and modern critiques of institutional religion, while assessing both the prophetic force and theological limits of his project in modern theology.

Keywords: Leo Tolstoy, Didache, primitive Christianity, early Christianity, Tolstoyan theology, Christian anarchism, Christian nonviolence, nonresistance to evil, Sermon on the Mount, Two Ways tradition, Russian Orthodox Church, ecclesiology, sacramental theology, Christology, Christian ethics, church and state, religious rationalism, pacifism, Kingdom of God, patristic reception.

OpenAI GPT-5.5 Thinking. CC4.0. 65 pages.

https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4206-4253

Outline

1. Introduction: Reconsidering Tolstoy Through the Didache
Approximate expanded length: 650 words.

1.1 The prevailing interpretation of Tolstoy's Christianity
Introduce the conventional view of Tolstoy as a religious moralist who retained the ethical teachings of Jesus while rejecting most traditional Christian doctrine.

1.2 The neglected significance of the Didache
Explain why Tolstoy's work with the Didache provides an important but insufficiently examined window into his understanding of Christian origins.

1.3 Central thesis and governing questions
Present the argument that Tolstoy used the Didache selectively, embracing its practical moral instruction while reinterpreting or marginalizing its sacramental, ecclesial, and eschatological elements.

1.4 Method and scope
Describe the paper's comparative approach to Tolstoy's theological writings, his adaptation of the Didache, the ancient text itself, and the teachings of historic Christianity.

2. Tolstoy's Religious Crisis and Search for a Livable Faith
Approximate expanded length: 800 words.

2.1 Success, mortality, and the collapse of meaning
Examine the existential crisis described by Tolstoy after he had achieved literary fame, wealth, and social standing.

2.2 The limitations of science, philosophy, and culture
Discuss his conclusion that modern knowledge could describe life but could not provide a sufficient reason for living.

2.3 Faith as the power by which human beings live
Explain Tolstoy's emerging definition of faith as an orientation that gives finite life meaning in relation to the infinite.

2.4 The religion of ordinary people
Consider how peasants and laborers influenced his conviction that genuine religion must be embodied in daily life rather than confined to intellectual speculation.

2.5 From existential conversion to theological reconstruction
Show how Tolstoy's personal crisis developed into a broader attempt to recover what he believed to be the authentic teaching of Jesus.

3. The Didache and the World of Primitive Christianity
Approximate expanded length: 850 words.

3.1 Discovery, dating, and historical importance
Introduce the modern recovery of the Didache and explain its significance as an early Christian manual of ethics, worship, discipline, and community order.

3.2 The Two Ways tradition
Analyze the contrast between the Way of Life and the Way of Death as the ethical foundation of the document.

3.3 The teachings of Jesus in the Didache
Examine the text's commands concerning love of enemies, generosity, anger, sexual conduct, truthful speech, and treatment of the vulnerable.

3.4 Baptism, fasting, prayer, and Eucharist
Describe the ritual and devotional practices that reveal an organized communal Christianity rather than an exclusively private moral philosophy.

3.5 Apostles, prophets, bishops, and deacons
Discuss the document's developing structures of authority, discernment, hospitality, and leadership.

3.6 Resurrection, judgment, and the coming of the Lord
Consider the apocalyptic conclusion of the Didache and its expectation of a future divine consummation.

4. Tolstoy's Translation and Adaptation of the Didache
Approximate expanded length: 850 words.

4.1 Tolstoy's encounter with the newly recovered text
Place his work within the intense nineteenth-century interest generated by the rediscovery and publication of the Didache.

4.2 From translation to extensive revision
Clarify the relationship between Tolstoy's version, earlier Russian translations, the Greek text, and other European-language editions.

4.3 The intended popular audience
Examine Tolstoy's effort to make the Didache intelligible and morally compelling to ordinary Russian readers.

4.4 Simplification as theological interpretation
Show that his linguistic revisions were inseparable from judgments about what constituted the essential message of Christianity.

4.5 Prefatory and concluding commentary
Analyze how Tolstoy framed the document as evidence that early Christianity was fundamentally a practical way of life.

4.6 The Didache within Tolstoy's larger religious project
Relate the adaptation to his other efforts to edit, harmonize, translate, and reinterpret foundational Christian texts.

5. Primitive Christianity as a Hermeneutical Ideal
Approximate expanded length: 800 words.

5.1 The narrative of original purity and later corruption
Explore Tolstoy's belief that Jesus' simple teaching was gradually obscured by theology, ritual, clerical authority, and alliance with political power.

5.2 Commandments before dogmas
Explain his distinction between living according to Jesus and affirming propositions about Jesus.

5.3 Reason, conscience, and religious authority
Examine Tolstoy's use of moral reason as a criterion for accepting, rejecting, or reinterpreting biblical and ecclesiastical claims.

5.4 The problem of the canon
Discuss his willingness to rearrange canonical materials while elevating certain noncanonical witnesses to early Christianity.

5.5 Historical recovery or modern reconstruction
Ask whether Tolstoy discovered primitive Christianity or created a version of it shaped by modern rationalism and moral idealism.

6. Jesus, Christology, and the Meaning of the Gospel
Approximate expanded length: 800 words.

6.1 Jesus as revealer and teacher of the law of life
Present Tolstoy's understanding of Jesus as the supreme teacher and embodiment of divine moral truth.

6.2 Rejection of Nicene Christology
Examine his denial or reinterpretation of the Trinity, incarnation, virgin birth, miracles, and the eternal divinity of Christ.

6.3 The Gospel in Brief and the reconstructed Jesus
Analyze Tolstoy's harmonization of the Gospels and his concentration on sayings that supported his ethical interpretation.

6.4 Cross, atonement, and resurrection
Contrast Tolstoy's position with traditional claims that salvation depends upon Christ's death and bodily resurrection.

6.5 The Didache's presentation of Jesus
Consider the extent to which the ancient text supports an ethical emphasis while still belonging to a worshiping community with theological and eschatological convictions.

6.6 Teaching about Jesus and faith in Jesus
Develop the fundamental contrast between Christianity as obedience to Jesus' commandments and Christianity as participation in the saving life of Christ.

7. The Two Ways, the Sermon on the Mount, and Tolstoyan Ethics
Approximate expanded length: 950 words.

7.1 The Way of Life as practical Christianity
Compare the opening ethical program of the Didache with Tolstoy's understanding of the commandments of Jesus.

7.2 Love of God and love of neighbor
Explore the relational foundation of Tolstoy's ethics and its correspondence with early Christian moral instruction.

7.3 Anger, reconciliation, and the prohibition of contempt
Examine the movement from external conduct to the inward sources of hostility and violence.

7.4 Sexual desire, marriage, and moral discipline
Discuss Tolstoy's demanding views of chastity, desire, family life, and bodily self-control.

7.5 Oaths, truthfulness, and divided loyalties
Explain why Tolstoy regarded oath-taking as incompatible with allegiance to God and especially relevant to courts, armies, and governments.

7.6 Generosity, property, and care for the poor
Analyze the ethical challenge posed by early Christian teaching concerning possessions, almsgiving, labor, and economic inequality.

7.7 Moral perfection and the problem of attainability
Consider whether Tolstoy understood the commands of Jesus as immediately practicable, progressively realizable, or permanently demanding ideals.

8. Nonresistance, Political Violence, and Christian Anarchism
Approximate expanded length: 900 words.

8.1 The command not to resist evil by violence
Explain why Tolstoy regarded nonresistance as the decisive and most neglected teaching of Jesus.

8.2 Enemy-love as a social principle
Show how a command commonly treated as private morality became, for Tolstoy, the foundation of an alternative political order.

8.3 War, military service, and patriotic religion
Examine his condemnation of conscription, nationalism, military chaplaincy, and ecclesiastical blessing of warfare.

8.4 Courts, prisons, punishment, and execution
Discuss Tolstoy's argument that legal systems institutionalize coercion and retaliation contrary to the teaching of Christ.

8.5 The state as organized violence
Present the reasoning by which Tolstoy moved from Christian nonviolence to a form of religious anarchism.

8.6 Rejection of violent revolution
Clarify why he opposed revolutionary terrorism as strongly as he opposed governmental violence.

8.7 Conscientious withdrawal and social transformation
Analyze his belief that oppressive systems would weaken when individuals refused to participate in violence, falsehood, and exploitation.

9. Church, Sacrament, and Ecclesial Authority
Approximate expanded length: 950 words.

9.1 Tolstoy's indictment of institutional Christianity
Examine his charge that churches betrayed Jesus by accumulating wealth, enforcing dogma, supporting governments, and blessing violence.

9.2 Conflict with the Russian Orthodox Church
Describe the theological and institutional dispute that culminated in his formal separation from Orthodox communion.

9.3 Baptism in the Didache
Consider the document's Trinitarian baptismal practice and the difficulty it creates for Tolstoy's rejection of traditional dogma.

9.4 Fasting and fixed prayer
Analyze the Didache's regulated devotional practices as evidence of communal religious discipline.

9.5 Eucharistic thanksgiving and sacred community
Examine whether the Didache's meal prayers can be reduced to ethical fellowship or imply a more distinctive sacramental identity.

9.6 Bishops, deacons, prophets, and communal order
Compare the Didache's recognition of religious offices with Tolstoy's distrust of clerical hierarchy.

9.7 Can primitive Christianity be separated from the church?
Evaluate whether Tolstoy's interpretation extracts early Christian ethics from the ecclesial setting in which those ethics were preserved and practiced.

10. Salvation, Grace, Resurrection, and the Kingdom of God
Approximate expanded length: 850 words.

10.1 Salvation as moral awakening
Explain Tolstoy's understanding of salvation as liberation from egoism, fear, violence, and meaningless existence.

10.2 Repentance as transformation of life
Discuss his insistence that repentance must produce concrete obedience rather than reliance upon ritual absolution or verbal confession.

10.3 The diminished place of grace
Evaluate the criticism that Tolstoy's theology makes human moral effort primary while neglecting divine initiative and empowerment.

10.4 Rejection of substitutionary and sacrificial atonement
Contrast his interpretation of the cross with major Orthodox and Western accounts of reconciliation.

10.5 Eternal life and the fate of the individual person
Examine his treatment of immortality, participation in infinite life, and the dissolution or transcendence of the isolated self.

10.6 The Kingdom of God within and among humanity
Analyze the kingdom as an inward spiritual awakening with radical social consequences.

10.7 The Didache's future resurrection and judgment
Consider the tension between Tolstoy's inward interpretation of eternal life and the Didache's expectation of a future coming, resurrection, and judgment.

11. Selective Retrieval or Faithful Recovery? A Critical Assessment
Approximate expanded length: 900 words.

11.1 Genuine continuities with the Didache
Identify the substantial agreements between Tolstoy and the ancient text concerning ethical seriousness, enemy-love, generosity, discipline, and lived discipleship.

11.2 Strategic omissions and reinterpretations
Assess the ritual, ecclesial, Christological, and eschatological features that Tolstoy minimized or absorbed into his moral framework.

11.3 The danger of reducing Christianity to ethics
Examine the argument that Christian conduct cannot be detached from beliefs about God, Christ, grace, resurrection, and the worshiping community.

11.4 The prophetic strength of Tolstoy's critique
Recognize the enduring force of his exposure of Christian accommodation to warfare, nationalism, inequality, punishment, and state power.

11.5 The theological limits of moral rationalism
Consider whether his method allowed revelation to challenge reason or permitted reason to retain only the elements of revelation it already approved.

11.6 Tolstoy as translator, reformer, and modern church father
Evaluate his unusual position as a modern literary figure who retrieved an ancient Christian text to authorize a radical reformation of Christian life.

11.7 The unresolved paradox
Conclude that Tolstoy drew authority from primitive Christianity while reconstructing it in ways that the primitive Christian communities themselves might not have recognized.

12. Conclusion: Tolstoy's Didache and the Future of Christian Witness
Approximate expanded length: 700 words.

12.1 Summary of the central argument
Restate how Tolstoy appropriated the Didache as a witness to practical Christianity while selectively resisting its broader theological world.

12.2 Reassessment of Tolstoy's theology

Present his thought as more historically engaged than a simple ethical humanism but less continuous with early Christianity than he believed.

12.3 Contributions to Tolstoy studies and early Christian studies

Explain how attention to his Didache adaptation enriches the study of his theology, hermeneutics, politics, and reception of Christian antiquity.

12.4 The challenge to contemporary Christianity

Reflect on Tolstoy's continuing question: whether churches can proclaim the crucified Christ while legitimating violence, domination, nationalism, and economic injustice.

12.5 Final judgment

Conclude with a balanced assessment of Tolstoy as both a penetrating prophetic critic of Christian civilization and a selective theological reformer whose recovery of primitive Christianity remained incomplete.

13. References

This final section will contain the complete bibliography and all source information used throughout the paper. It will include Tolstoy's primary theological works, his version of the Didache, critical editions and translations of the ancient text, historical studies of its discovery and composition, scholarship on Tolstoyan religion and Christian anarchism, Russian Orthodox responses, and relevant studies of nonviolence, ecclesiology, Christology, sacramental theology, and early Christian ethics. No references, hyperlinks, or source notes will appear in Sections 1–12.

Art

1. Introduction: Reconsidering Tolstoy Through the Didache

Leo Tolstoy occupies an unusual position in the history of Christian thought. He was neither a conventional theologian nor merely a literary author who occasionally addressed religion. In the final decades of his life, he undertook a sustained reconstruction of Christianity that challenged the doctrines, institutions, and political alliances of the churches of his time. His religious writings presented Christianity as a way of life grounded in the teachings of Jesus, especially the commands of the Sermon on the Mount. He rejected the view that Christian identity consists primarily in assent to creeds, participation in sacraments, or membership in an ecclesiastical institution. For Tolstoy, the decisive question was whether a person obeyed the commandments of Christ.

This interpretation has usually been studied through works such as A Confession, The Gospel in Brief, What I Believe, and The Kingdom of God Is Within You. These writings reveal the central features of Tolstoy's mature theology: his search for meaning in the face of death, his rejection of supernatural dogma, his emphasis on moral transformation, his condemnation of violence, and his opposition to the alliance of church and state. Yet his engagement with the Didache adds an important historical dimension to this theological project. By adapting and popularizing one of the earliest surviving Christian manuals, Tolstoy appealed to primitive Christianity as a witness against the institutional Christianity of his own age.

1.1 The Prevailing Interpretation of Tolstoy's Christianity

Tolstoy is commonly interpreted as a Christian moralist who separated the ethical teaching of Jesus from traditional claims about Jesus' divine identity and saving work. According to this interpretation, he retained the commandments of Christ while rejecting the doctrines of the Trinity, incarnation, atonement, resurrection, and sacramental grace. Jesus became, in Tolstoy's theology, the supreme teacher of the divine law of love rather than the incarnate Son of God proclaimed by the historic creeds.

This description is broadly accurate, but it can oversimplify his project. Tolstoy did not understand himself as replacing Christianity with a secular moral philosophy. He believed he was recovering Christianity from centuries of distortion. In his view, theologians had transformed a practical teaching into a system of metaphysical propositions, while churches had exchanged the commands of Jesus for rituals, hierarchies, and political privilege. Tolstoy's moral emphasis was therefore inseparable from a historical claim: authentic Christianity had once existed as a disciplined way of life before it was obscured by dogma and institutional power.

1.2 The Neglected Significance of the Didache

Tolstoy's interest in the Didache is especially significant because the document appeared to offer direct evidence for an early form of Christianity organized around conduct. Its opening

contrast between the Way of Life and the Way of Death closely resembled Tolstoy's conviction that religion must be expressed in concrete choices. The text commands love of God and neighbor, generosity toward the poor, truthful speech, moral restraint, and rejection of anger, greed, and violence. It therefore supplied Tolstoy with an ancient witness to Christianity as lived obedience.

At the same time, the Didache does not present Christianity as ethics alone. It includes instructions concerning baptism, fasting, prayer, Eucharistic thanksgiving, itinerant teachers, prophets, bishops, deacons, communal discipline, resurrection, judgment, and the coming of the Lord. These elements complicate any attempt to portray primitive Christianity as a purely rational moral code. Tolstoy's appropriation of the text must therefore be examined not only for what he emphasized but also for what he minimized, reinterpreted, or left unresolved.

1.3 Central Thesis and Governing Questions

This paper argues that Tolstoy used the Didache as historical support for a radical reconstruction of Christianity centered on practice, nonviolence, and moral transformation. He recognized in the document a form of discipleship that gave priority to conduct over theological speculation. Its Two Ways teaching strengthened his conviction that Christianity was originally a path to be followed rather than a creed to be confessed.

Yet Tolstoy's recovery was selective. The Didache's communal worship, sacramental practices, ministerial offices, and eschatological expectations resist reduction to the ethical religion he sought to establish. His interpretation reveals both a genuine continuity with early Christian moral seriousness and a distinctly modern tendency to judge the tradition according to the standards of reason and conscience.

Several questions therefore govern the discussion. Did Tolstoy recover primitive Christianity, or did he reconstruct it in his own image? Can the ethics of the Didache be separated from its ecclesial and theological setting? Does Tolstoy's interpretation expose authentic corruptions in later Christianity, or does it exclude essential elements of the faith from the beginning?

1.4 Method and Scope

The study proceeds through a comparative theological and historical reading. Tolstoy's major religious works will be examined alongside his adaptation of the Didache and the ancient document in its complete form. Particular attention will be given to the Two Ways tradition, the Sermon on the Mount, nonresistance to evil, church authority, sacramental practice, salvation, resurrection, and the Kingdom of God.

The purpose is not merely to determine whether Tolstoy translated the Didache accurately. The deeper issue is how he used an ancient text to authorize a modern religious program. His

engagement with the Didache illuminates the central tension of his theology: he appealed to early Christianity as a corrective to the churches while interpreting early Christianity through principles that placed much of its worship, doctrine, and communal structure under suspicion. This tension provides the framework for assessing both the prophetic force and the theological limitations of Tolstoy's Christian vision.

2. Tolstoy's Religious Crisis and Search for a Livable Faith

Tolstoy's mature theology emerged from a personal crisis rather than from academic speculation. By the late 1870s, he had achieved nearly everything his culture taught him to desire. He possessed literary fame, wealth, social standing, a large family, and an international reputation. Yet these accomplishments no longer provided a convincing reason to live. The inevitability of death appeared to empty every temporary achievement of lasting significance. His religious thought began, therefore, with a question more fundamental than the truth of any particular doctrine: what makes human life worth living when every individual, institution, and civilization is destined to disappear?

This crisis shaped Tolstoy's later interpretation of Christianity. He did not initially turn to religion because he wanted a more coherent theory of God or a better explanation of church doctrine. He sought a form of truth capable of sustaining life. Faith would be credible only if it could overcome despair, orient conduct, and give meaning to ordinary existence. His theology consequently remained practical even when it addressed metaphysical questions. The value of a religious teaching was measured by whether it enabled human beings to live rationally, morally, and without terror before death.

2.1 Success, Mortality, and the Collapse of Meaning

Tolstoy described his crisis as a gradual loss of confidence in the purposes that had previously directed his life. Literary creation, family responsibility, material improvement, and public recognition continued to occupy him, but he could no longer regard them as final goods. Each appeared vulnerable to the same objection: death would eventually erase both the person who acted and the world in which the action mattered.

The problem was not simply fear of dying. Tolstoy confronted a crisis of intelligibility. If death reduced every ambition to nothing, then ordinary pursuits seemed comparable to distractions performed by a condemned person awaiting execution. One might accumulate wealth, educate children, write books, or improve society, but the question remained: what would come of it in the end?

This confrontation with mortality exposed the fragility of the values of his social class. Aristocratic privilege, artistic prestige, and intellectual refinement offered no convincing answer. Tolstoy came to suspect that much of cultivated life was organized to conceal rather than resolve the problem of death. Entertainment, ambition, competition, and reputation kept people occupied, but they did not provide an ultimate justification for existence.

His crisis also revealed the inadequacy of purely individual meaning. A purpose created only by personal preference could be destroyed by suffering, failure, or death. Tolstoy therefore sought a meaning not invented by the isolated self. It had to connect finite life with something infinite and enduring.

2.2 The Limitations of Science, Philosophy, and Culture

Tolstoy turned to the intellectual resources available to him, but he found that neither science nor philosophy could answer his central question. Science explained processes, causes, structures, and relationships within the observable world. It could describe the biological conditions of life and death, but it could not explain why a person ought to continue living.

The more accurately science described humanity as a temporary product of impersonal natural processes, the more it seemed to intensify Tolstoy's despair. Scientific knowledge could answer how life developed, but not what life ultimately meant. It could extend life, reduce suffering, and increase human power, yet it could not identify a final purpose worthy of sacrifice or obedience.

Philosophy approached the question more directly, but Tolstoy concluded that its most rigorous forms often confirmed the apparent absurdity of existence. Skepticism dissolved inherited certainties without replacing them. Pessimism recognized suffering and impermanence but offered resignation rather than redemption. Abstract metaphysics proposed systems that seemed remote from the immediate demand to live.

Tolstoy also became disillusioned with the cultural ideal of progress. The belief that education, technology, art, and political reform would steadily improve humanity seemed unable to account for violence, exploitation, and mortality. Progress might alter the conditions of life, but it did not answer the question of life's final purpose. Nor could it guarantee moral improvement. A technically advanced society might remain governed by greed, warfare, domination, and fear.

His criticism did not require the rejection of science or reason. Rather, he denied that they could perform tasks beyond their proper limits. Scientific inquiry could describe finite reality, but the meaning of life required a relationship to the infinite.

2.3 Faith as the Power by Which Human Beings Live

Tolstoy gradually came to define faith not primarily as belief in miracles, creeds, or ecclesiastical authority, but as the knowledge of life's meaning. Faith was that orientation by which a person understood finite existence in relation to an infinite whole. Without such an orientation, life dissolved into contradiction: human beings continued to act as though their choices mattered while believing that death rendered everything meaningless.

Faith, in this sense, was universal. Every person who continued to live possessed some answer, explicit or implicit, to the question of why life was worth preserving. The issue was whether that answer could survive rational examination. Wealth, fame, pleasure, family, and social approval could provide temporary motives, but they remained finite. They could not establish a meaning immune to loss and death.

Tolstoy's recovery of faith therefore involved a reorientation from the isolated self toward a larger moral reality. Life gained meaning when it was understood as service to a good that transcended individual desire. The person who lived for truth, love, and the good of others participated in something greater than personal survival.

This conception helps explain why Tolstoy interpreted Christianity ethically. If faith was the power by which one lived, then its truth had to become visible in conduct. A profession of belief that did not transform life could not answer his crisis. Religion had to produce a coherent way of living in relation to death, suffering, other persons, and God.

2.4 The Religion of Ordinary People

A decisive influence on Tolstoy was his observation of ordinary working people, especially peasants whose lives were marked by labor, hardship, and insecurity. Many possessed little education and no philosophical sophistication, yet they appeared able to endure suffering and face death without the despair that afflicted him.

Tolstoy did not imagine that every expression of popular religion was pure or rational. He recognized superstition, inconsistency, and moral failure among believers. Nevertheless, he perceived in ordinary faith an acceptance of life as service rather than private possession. Work, family obligation, suffering, and death could be understood as parts of a larger divine order.

This discovery reversed the assumptions of his social world. The educated classes regarded themselves as intellectually superior to the peasantry, but Tolstoy concluded that they might be less capable of answering life's most basic question. Their sophistication enabled them to criticize religious belief, yet it often left them without a reason to live.

The importance of ordinary believers also reinforced Tolstoy's suspicion of elaborate theology. A true religion, he believed, had to be accessible to all people. It could not depend upon technical

metaphysics, clerical education, or participation in a privileged institution. Its central truths had to be simple enough to guide daily life while profound enough to overcome despair.

2.5 From Existential Conversion to Theological Reconstruction

Tolstoy's return to faith did not result in submission to the established church. He initially approached Orthodox Christianity with seriousness, participating in worship and attempting to accept its teachings. He soon concluded, however, that the church combined genuine moral truth with doctrines and practices that reason and conscience could not approve.

This judgment transformed his private crisis into a public theological project. He began distinguishing the teaching of Jesus from the dogmatic system constructed around it. He studied the Gospels, compared translations, examined key terms, and attempted to reconstruct what he regarded as the original message of Christ.

The result was not a return to inherited orthodoxy but a radical reinterpretation of Christianity. Tolstoy identified the essence of faith with obedience to the law of love, rejection of violence, renunciation of selfish desire, and service to others. Doctrines that did not contribute to this transformation were treated as secondary, mistaken, or corrupting.

His religious crisis therefore supplied both the motive and the criterion of his theology. He sought a faith that could be lived, that could withstand the knowledge of death, and that could unite reason with moral action. This search eventually led him beyond the canonical Gospels to early Christian witnesses such as the Didache. In that ancient manual, he found support for his conviction that Christianity had originally been presented not merely as a set of beliefs, but as a way of life.

3. The Didache and the World of Primitive Christianity

The Didache occupies a distinctive place among the surviving writings of early Christianity. Its title, commonly rendered as The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, suggests apostolic authority, yet the work is not a narrative of the apostles and does not present itself as a theological treatise. It is better understood as a practical manual for Christian formation and communal life. Its contents move from moral instruction to baptism, fasting, prayer, Eucharistic thanksgiving, hospitality, leadership, discipline, and expectation of the end. The document therefore provides a compact view of Christianity at a stage when ethical teaching, liturgical practice, charismatic authority, and emerging institutional order remained closely connected.

This combination made the Didache especially attractive to Tolstoy. Its opening chapters present Christianity as a path of conduct, and much of its moral instruction resonates with the Sermon on the Mount. Yet the full text also presents difficulties for his interpretation. The Didache

assumes a worshiping community with established practices, recognized leaders, sacramental rites, and a vivid expectation of divine judgment. It cannot be reduced without remainder to a rational code of ethics. Any use of the Didache as evidence for primitive Christianity must therefore attend to the unity of its moral, communal, ritual, and eschatological dimensions.

3.1 Discovery, Dating, and Historical Importance

The modern recovery of the Didache created considerable excitement because the text appeared to provide direct access to forms of Christian life close to the apostolic period. Although the work had been known by title through ancient references, the complete text disappeared from general circulation for centuries. Its rediscovery in the nineteenth century gave scholars, clergy, and religious reformers a document that seemed to stand between the New Testament and the more developed ecclesiastical writings of later Christianity.

The date of the Didache remains debated because the document may contain materials from different periods. Some of its moral traditions are likely very early, while portions concerning church order may reflect later stages of development. It is therefore more accurate to think of the text as preserving layers of tradition than as the product of a single moment. Many scholars place its composition or final formation somewhere in the late first or early second century, although arguments have been made for both earlier and later elements.

Its historical importance lies partly in what it does not contain. The Didache offers no sustained narrative of Jesus' life, no developed account of the incarnation, and no extended theory of atonement. It does not resemble the theological argumentation of Paul or the high Christology of the Gospel of John. Instead, it instructs communities in how to live, worship, receive travelers, test religious claims, appoint leaders, and prepare for the end.

This practical orientation can create the impression that doctrine was unimportant to its authors. That conclusion would be too strong. The document presupposes beliefs about God, Jesus, the Holy Spirit, divine judgment, resurrection, and the identity of the church. Its theology is embedded in communal practice rather than expressed through systematic exposition.

3.2 The Two Ways Tradition

The opening portion of the Didache is organized around a contrast between two paths: the Way of Life and the Way of Death. This structure was not unique to Christianity. Jewish moral instruction had long used the image of two ways to describe the choice between obedience and rebellion, wisdom and folly, life and destruction. The Didache adopts this pattern and reshapes it within a Christian setting.

The Way of Life begins with the commandments to love God and one's neighbor. It then extends the principle of love into demanding forms of conduct. Disciples are instructed to bless those

who curse them, pray for enemies, fast for persecutors, turn the other cheek, give to those who ask, and refuse retaliation. The moral life is presented not as passive respectability but as a radical reordering of desire, possession, speech, and relationships.

The text also condemns anger, lust, greed, dishonesty, hypocrisy, arrogance, and neglect of the poor. Its ethical method frequently traces outward sins back to inward dispositions. Anger is dangerous because it prepares the way for violence. Lust prepares the way for sexual wrongdoing. Love of wealth produces exploitation and indifference. The disciple must therefore resist not only forbidden acts but also the habits and desires from which those acts arise.

The Way of Death gathers the opposite qualities into a portrait of social and spiritual disintegration. Violence, deceit, pride, injustice, exploitation, and hostility to the poor belong together. Sin is not treated merely as private failure. It corrupts communities by teaching the powerful to dominate and the weak to fear.

For Tolstoy, this structure confirmed that Christianity was fundamentally a choice between rival ways of living. Yet the Didache's Two Ways tradition also assumes communal teaching, correction, and discipline. The path is personal, but it is not individualistic.

3.3 The Teachings of Jesus in the Didache

The Didache contains numerous sayings and commands that closely resemble teachings preserved in the canonical Gospels, particularly Matthew. The text reflects the moral world of the Sermon on the Mount: enemy-love, nonretaliation, generosity, purity of intention, disciplined prayer, fasting, and readiness for judgment. These correspondences make the document an important witness to the early reception of Jesus' teachings.

The Didache does not simply quote Jesus as an authority from the past. His commands shape the identity of the community. The teachings are presented as instructions to be learned, practiced, and transmitted. Christianity appears as a form of apprenticeship in which believers are trained to embody a distinct manner of life.

Love of enemies is especially significant. In ordinary political and social life, communities define themselves partly through opposition to outsiders. The Didache instead places the treatment of enemies within the center of discipleship. The disciple is not merely forbidden to hate; he or she is commanded to answer hostility with prayer, blessing, and restraint.

Generosity is treated with similar seriousness. The believer's possessions are not wholly private, because the needs of others create moral claims. Giving must not become careless support for manipulation, but caution cannot be used as a justification for indifference. The ethical challenge is to combine mercy with discernment.

The Didache also places great weight on speech. False testimony, slander, double-mindedness, and hypocrisy destroy trust. Truthfulness is therefore not an isolated virtue but a condition of communal life. This concern would later resonate strongly with Tolstoy's opposition to political oaths, propaganda, legal falsehood, and religious hypocrisy.

3.4 Baptism, Fasting, Prayer, and Eucharist

After the Two Ways instruction, the Didache turns to practices that mark entry into and participation in the Christian community. Baptism is administered in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The preferred setting is living, flowing water, but the text permits adaptations when ideal conditions are unavailable. This combination of fixed form and practical flexibility suggests an already established rite adapted to differing local circumstances.

Fasting accompanies baptism and also forms part of the regular rhythm of Christian life. The community is instructed to distinguish its fasting practices from those of rival religious groups. This indicates that early Christian identity was expressed through bodily disciplines as well as moral convictions.

Prayer is similarly regulated. The Lord's Prayer is to be offered repeatedly each day. Such instruction reveals that primitive Christianity was not merely spontaneous or inward. It included memorized prayer, recurring patterns, and shared forms of devotion.

The Eucharistic prayers are among the most striking portions of the document. They express thanksgiving for life, knowledge, creation, spiritual nourishment, and the revelation given through Jesus. They also pray for the gathering of the church into unity. Whatever precise ritual setting these prayers originally served, they reveal a community that understood eating, thanksgiving, memory, and hope as sacred acts.

These practices create a substantial challenge to any account of the Didache as a purely ethical text. Moral conduct and worship are not placed in opposition. The Way of Life leads into baptism, prayer, fasting, and common thanksgiving. The community practices what it believes, and its beliefs are reinforced through repeated communal acts.

3.5 Apostles, Prophets, Bishops, and Deacons

The Didache reflects a transitional form of Christian leadership. Traveling apostles and prophets still move among communities, yet local bishops and deacons are also recognized. Charismatic and institutional forms of authority coexist.

The text treats itinerant religious figures with both respect and suspicion. Genuine apostles and prophets are to be received, but their conduct must be tested. A teacher who exploits hospitality, demands money, or remains too long may reveal himself as false. Spiritual claims do not exempt a person from moral evaluation.

Prophets occupy an especially important place because they may speak with charismatic authority and preside in worship. Yet even prophets are judged by their way of life. The Didache therefore refuses both automatic submission and cynical rejection. Authority is discerned through conformity to the teaching and conduct expected of the community.

Bishops and deacons represent a more settled local order. Their appointment indicates that Christian communities required dependable leadership, administration, worship, and care. The text urges believers not to despise these officers, suggesting that charismatic figures may sometimes have been regarded as more impressive than local ministers.

For Tolstoy, the moral testing of religious leaders would have been attractive. The recognition of formal offices was less compatible with his suspicion of clerical authority. The Didache supports criticism of corrupt leaders, but it does not support the elimination of organized ministry.

3.6 Resurrection, Judgment, and the Coming of the Lord

The final portion of the Didache turns toward eschatology. Believers are instructed to remain watchful because the time of fulfillment is unknown. The text anticipates deception, persecution, cosmic signs, the appearance of a final adversary, resurrection, and the coming of the Lord.

This conclusion is not an accidental appendix. It gives urgency to the entire document. The choice between the Way of Life and the Way of Death matters because history moves toward judgment. Ethical conduct is not merely beneficial for social harmony; it prepares persons and communities to stand before God.

The Didache's eschatology also prevents primitive Christianity from being interpreted solely as a program for gradual moral progress. The community works, prays, gives, baptizes, fasts, and appoints leaders, but it does so in expectation of divine action. The fulfillment of the Kingdom is not produced entirely by human obedience.

This aspect of the text creates one of the clearest tensions with Tolstoy. He frequently interpreted the Kingdom of God as an inward and social reality realized through obedience to the law of love. The Didache affirms ethical transformation, but it also looks beyond human moral development to resurrection, judgment, and the coming of the Lord.

The document therefore both supports and resists Tolstoy's reconstruction. It supports his insistence that Christianity is a demanding way of life. It resists his tendency to detach that way from sacrament, church order, revealed expectation, and divine intervention. The Didache bears witness not to ethics in isolation, but to an early Christian world in which conduct, worship, community, and hope formed a single pattern of discipleship.

4. Tolstoy's Translation and Adaptation of the Didache

Tolstoy's engagement with the Didache was not an incidental exercise in ancient literature. It formed part of his larger effort to recover what he regarded as the original moral teaching of Christianity. The rediscovery of the text in the nineteenth century offered him a document that appeared to stand close to the earliest Christian communities and to preserve a practical pattern of discipleship before the full development of later creeds, ecclesiastical institutions, and theological systems. Its emphasis on the Two Ways, enemy-love, generosity, self-discipline, and communal responsibility strongly reinforced his conviction that Christianity was originally a rule of life rather than a metaphysical doctrine.

Yet Tolstoy did not approach the Didache as a neutral historian or professional philologist. He approached it as a religious reformer. Translation, for him, was inseparable from interpretation, and interpretation was inseparable from moral judgment. He sought to make the document accessible to ordinary readers, but he also sought to clarify what he believed to be its essential message. His version therefore stands between translation, revision, adaptation, and theological appropriation.

This distinction is important. To describe Tolstoy simply as the translator of the Didache may suggest a direct and strictly literal rendering from the Greek. His work was more complex. He relied substantially upon an existing Russian translation, consulted other linguistic resources, compared passages with the Greek, revised the language repeatedly, and reshaped the presentation for a popular audience. The resulting text bore the marks of both the ancient document and Tolstoy's mature religious program.

4.1 Tolstoy's Encounter with the Newly Recovered Text

The Didache became widely known in Europe only after its complete text was recovered and published in the nineteenth century. Its appearance generated intense interest because it seemed to provide a window into Christian life near the end of the apostolic age. Scholars debated its date, sources, theology, liturgy, and relationship to the New Testament. Clergy regarded it as evidence for early baptismal, Eucharistic, and ministerial practices. Reformers saw in it a possible standard against which later Christianity could be judged.

Tolstoy encountered the document at a moment when he was already attempting to distinguish the teaching of Jesus from the doctrines and institutions of the established churches. The Didache therefore entered a theological landscape he had already prepared. He had come to believe that the central truths of Christianity were simple, practical, universal, and accessible to human conscience. He had also concluded that later religious authorities had obscured those truths through dogmatic complexity, ritual elaboration, and alliance with political power.

The Didache appeared to confirm much of this account. Its opening moral instruction did not begin with abstract theological propositions. It began with two ways and the demand to choose between them. The believer was instructed to love, give, forgive, restrain anger, avoid lust, speak truthfully, and care for the vulnerable. Christianity appeared in these chapters as an ordered life of obedience.

Tolstoy's interest was therefore immediate and theological. He did not value the text merely because it was old. Antiquity alone did not guarantee truth for him. He valued it because its oldest and most prominent ethical material seemed to agree with the Christianity he was reconstructing from the teachings of Jesus.

4.2 From Translation to Extensive Revision

Tolstoy's version of the Didache should be understood as an extensive revision and popular adaptation rather than as a wholly independent translation produced directly from the Greek. He worked from an existing Russian rendering associated with the early reception of the newly published text. He then compared, corrected, simplified, and recast the material, consulting the Greek and at least one other European translation where he considered it necessary.

His repeated revisions demonstrate that he regarded the project seriously. The objective was not merely grammatical accuracy. He sought a Russian text that would communicate clearly and directly to readers who were not specialists in ancient languages or church history. Archaic expressions, technical constructions, and ecclesiastical terminology could obstruct the moral force of the document. Tolstoy therefore favored language that sounded immediate, practical, and intelligible.

Such revision inevitably involved interpretation. Every choice among possible words carries assumptions about meaning. A term may be rendered in a way that emphasizes religious ritual, communal discipline, or moral conduct. Tolstoy's choices generally favored the ethical and practical sense of the text. Where the Didache could be read as a manual of Christian behavior, he allowed that character to come forward with unusual clarity.

This does not mean that he simply falsified the document. Much of the Didache is genuinely practical, and its ethical directness is unmistakable. The problem lies not primarily in isolated mistranslations but in the cumulative effect of selection, emphasis, simplification, and framing. Tolstoy made the ancient text speak within his own theological argument.

The boundary between translation and adaptation is therefore central to understanding his work. He transmitted the Didache to a Russian readership, but he also interpreted its historical significance in advance. Readers encountered not only the ancient manual but also Tolstoy's judgment about what in that manual mattered most.

4.3 The Intended Popular Audience

Tolstoy's religious writings were directed beyond the academy and the clergy. He wanted ordinary readers to encounter religious truth without dependence upon ecclesiastical specialists. His adaptation of the Didache reflected this democratic purpose.

The text's moral simplicity suited his conviction that divine truth must be universally accessible. If Christianity depended upon mastery of technical doctrines, ancient languages, or sacramental systems, then ordinary people would remain dependent upon professional religious authorities. Tolstoy regarded such dependence with suspicion. He believed that the essential teaching of Jesus could be understood through reason, conscience, and sincere attention to the commandments.

The Didache offered a suitable instrument for this purpose because much of its language was imperative and concrete. It told readers what to avoid, how to treat others, how to pray, how to give, and how to distinguish the path of life from the path of death. It could be presented not as an archaeological curiosity but as instruction for present conduct.

Tolstoy's popularizing effort also reflected his criticism of literary and theological elitism. He had come to distrust forms of culture that existed principally for the educated classes. Religious truth, if genuine, had to belong equally to the peasant, laborer, aristocrat, and scholar. A translation that preserved scholarly precision while remaining inaccessible to common readers would fail his religious purpose.

The intended audience therefore shaped both style and content. Tolstoy sought clarity, simplicity, and moral urgency. He wanted the reader not merely to learn what early Christians once believed, but to confront the demand placed upon anyone who claimed to follow Christ.

4.4 Simplification as Theological Interpretation

Tolstoy's simplification of the Didache cannot be separated from his theological method. He believed that religious truth had been obscured by unnecessary complexity. To simplify a text was therefore, in his view, often to recover its original force.

This conviction governed his work on the canonical Gospels as well as the Didache. He distinguished between what he considered the authentic teaching of Jesus and later additions that emphasized miracle, metaphysics, ecclesiastical authority, or supernatural reward. He applied a similar instinct to the Didache. Its moral teaching could be foregrounded as the essence of primitive Christianity, while its ritual and institutional features could be treated as secondary developments or practical customs.

The danger of this method is circularity. Tolstoy first defined authentic Christianity as rational obedience to the moral law of Jesus. He then interpreted early Christian texts according to their

agreement with that definition. Passages that supported ethical Christianity appeared original and authoritative. Passages that suggested sacramental, ecclesial, Trinitarian, or apocalyptic Christianity were more readily classified as additions, accommodations, or misunderstandings.

Simplification thus became a form of theological sorting. The ancient document was not allowed to define primitive Christianity entirely on its own terms. It was evaluated by a prior conception of what primitive Christianity ought to have been.

At the same time, Tolstoy's method exposed a genuine problem. Religious institutions often hide clear moral demands beneath technical language and ceremonial observance. His simplification restored the unsettling directness of commands that churches could affirm verbally while ignoring practically. Love of enemies, renunciation of retaliation, generosity toward the poor, and discipline of desire could no longer be dismissed as marginal ideals.

His adaptation therefore combined distortion and disclosure. It narrowed the theological range of the Didache, yet it also recovered the practical seriousness of a text that could otherwise be treated mainly as evidence for ancient liturgy or church order.

4.5 Prefatory and Concluding Commentary

Tolstoy's framing of the Didache was as important as the translated text itself. Through introductory and concluding remarks, he guided readers toward a particular understanding of its significance. The document was presented as evidence that the earliest Christians regarded the teaching of Christ as a rule to be practiced.

This framing supported Tolstoy's polemic against the established church. If an ancient Christian manual emphasized conduct, then later Christianity could be judged by the degree to which it had preserved or abandoned that emphasis. Creeds, sacraments, and hierarchies could not compensate for disobedience to the commandments of Jesus. A church that blessed armies, tolerated economic oppression, and supported punishment could claim historical continuity while violating the moral substance of Christianity.

Tolstoy's commentary also implied that the recovery of the Didache was providentially or historically significant. The document allowed modern readers to compare contemporary religion with an earlier form of Christian life. It appeared to confirm that Christianity had once been simpler, more demanding, and less entangled with political power.

Yet his framing directed attention selectively. The same document also testified to baptism, fasting, fixed prayer, Eucharistic thanksgiving, church leadership, and expectation of the Lord's coming. These features did not fit comfortably within Tolstoy's claim that ritual and dogma represented later corruptions. His commentary therefore encouraged readers to distinguish between the supposed moral core of the text and its less authoritative religious forms.

The result was a powerful but contested interpretation. Tolstoy made the Didache function as a witness for Christian reform, but he did so by assigning different levels of value to its various components.

4.6 The Didache Within Tolstoy's Larger Religious Project

Tolstoy's adaptation of the Didache belongs beside his other efforts to reconstruct the sources of Christianity. In The Gospel in Brief, he reorganized the canonical narratives around what he regarded as the coherent moral teaching of Jesus. In his theological and polemical writings, he criticized the doctrines of the churches and contrasted them with the commandments of Christ. In his essays on nonresistance, war, punishment, and government, he applied those commandments to the structures of modern society.

The Didache provided a bridge between his Gospel interpretation and his account of early Christian history. It suggested that the moral teaching he extracted from Jesus had once been embodied in a communal rule of life. Tolstoy could therefore present his theology not merely as an individual modern insight but as a recovery of an ancient Christian pattern.

The text also strengthened his challenge to claims of institutional continuity. The churches often justified their authority by appealing to apostolic succession, sacramental tradition, and doctrinal preservation. Tolstoy countered with a different criterion of apostolicity: fidelity to the way of life taught by Jesus and practiced by his earliest followers. A church might preserve ancient forms while betraying the commandments those forms were meant to serve.

His use of the Didache thus reveals the constructive and polemical dimensions of his theology. Constructively, he sought a Christianity of love, truthfulness, simplicity, labor, generosity, and nonviolence. Polemically, he used primitive Christianity to indict churches that had accommodated themselves to wealth, hierarchy, nationalism, and coercion.

The Didache was particularly useful because it could not easily be dismissed as a modern invention. Its antiquity gave historical weight to Tolstoy's claim that Christianity was originally lived before it was systematized. Yet the document also exposed the limitations of that claim, because primitive Christian practice already included worship, ritual, authority, and eschatological belief.

Tolstoy's adaptation therefore stands as both a recovery and a reconstruction. It recovered the ethical intensity of an early Christian manual and brought it before a new readership. At the same time, it reconstructed that manual according to a theological program that privileged moral reason over ecclesial tradition and practical obedience over sacramental faith. The resulting work reveals Tolstoy at his most characteristic: translator and interpreter, critic and reformer, seeker of ancient truth and creator of a distinctly modern Christianity.

5. Primitive Christianity as a Hermeneutical Ideal

Tolstoy's appeal to primitive Christianity was not merely historical. It was hermeneutical: he used an imagined or reconstructed earliest form of the faith as a standard for judging later doctrine, worship, and ecclesiastical authority. The closer a teaching appeared to stand to Jesus' moral commands, the more authoritative Tolstoy considered it. The farther it seemed to move toward metaphysical speculation, sacramental mediation, clerical hierarchy, or political alliance, the more likely he was to regard it as corruption.

This method gave his theology both clarity and force. It allowed him to confront the churches with a simple question: had they preserved the life commanded by Jesus, or had they substituted beliefs and ceremonies for obedience? Yet the method also raised serious historical and theological problems. Primitive Christianity was not a single, unchanging system. The earliest Christian communities already possessed worship, communal discipline, theological confession, leadership, and eschatological expectation. Tolstoy's ideal of origins therefore functioned less as a neutral reconstruction of the past than as a criterion shaped by his own religious convictions.

5.1 The Narrative of Original Purity and Later Corruption

Tolstoy interpreted Christian history through a recurring pattern of original truth followed by institutional distortion. Jesus proclaimed a simple law of love, but later generations transformed that law into a religion of dogma, ritual, authority, and coercion. The original message was practical and universal; the later system was complex, divisive, and dependent upon ecclesiastical power.

According to this narrative, the decisive corruption occurred when Christianity ceased to be a persecuted way of life and became allied with the state. Once emperors, armies, courts, and social hierarchies adopted Christian language, the churches were compelled to reinterpret the commands of Jesus in ways compatible with political power. Enemy-love became an inward disposition rather than a prohibition of violence. Nonresistance became an ideal for private saints rather than a rule for public life. The refusal to swear oaths was replaced by legal and military pledges. Poverty and generosity were spiritualized while ecclesiastical institutions accumulated property and influence.

Tolstoy's account gave moral coherence to Christian history, but it also simplified it. The earliest communities were not free from conflict, authority, ritual, or doctrinal disagreement. Nor were later developments merely cynical inventions. Creeds, offices, and sacramental practices often arose from attempts to preserve communal identity and defend beliefs thought essential to the gospel.

Nevertheless, Tolstoy's narrative remained powerful because it exposed the possibility that historical continuity could coexist with moral betrayal. A church might preserve ancient terminology while abandoning the conduct that gave that terminology meaning. For Tolstoy, apostolic authenticity was measured not principally by succession of office but by fidelity to the commandments of Christ.

5.2 Commandments Before Dogmas

At the center of Tolstoy's hermeneutic was the priority of commandments over dogmas. He distinguished sharply between believing doctrines about Jesus and obeying the teaching of Jesus. The first could be professed without moral transformation; the second required a reordering of life.

This distinction shaped his reading of both the Gospels and the Didache. Teachings concerning love, reconciliation, generosity, chastity, truthfulness, and nonviolence were immediately intelligible as moral demands. By contrast, doctrines concerning divine nature, incarnation, atonement, resurrection, and sacramental grace appeared to require ecclesiastical explanation and metaphysical speculation.

Tolstoy believed this difference revealed the true hierarchy of Christian truth. Jesus had called people to live differently, not to master theological formulas. A person who accepted the creeds while supporting war, punishment, exploitation, and social domination could not be considered faithful merely because his doctrine was correct. Conversely, a person who lived according to love and truth might stand closer to Christ even without formal orthodoxy.

This emphasis gave Tolstoy's theology a prophetic simplicity. It refused to permit doctrine to become a substitute for discipleship. Yet it also created a false opposition when doctrine and commandment were treated as mutually exclusive. In early Christianity, beliefs about God, Christ, resurrection, judgment, and the Spirit were often understood as the grounds of moral life rather than alternatives to it. The commands were practiced because believers thought God had acted decisively in Christ and had formed a new community.

5.3 Reason, Conscience, and Religious Authority

Tolstoy rejected the claim that religious authority could override reason and conscience. He believed that divine truth must be morally intelligible and internally coherent. A teaching that required a person to call violence good, injustice necessary, or contradiction sacred could not be accepted merely because a church declared it authoritative.

Reason, in Tolstoy's theology, was not cold intellectual calculation. It was the human capacity to recognize the universal law of life. Conscience was the inward awareness that love, truthfulness,

and service belong to the proper order of existence. Together, reason and conscience enabled individuals to distinguish the teaching of Christ from the distortions imposed upon it.

This principle allowed Tolstoy to challenge immense religious and political institutions. No bishop, synod, government, or tradition could release a person from personal moral responsibility. The command to kill in war did not become righteous because it came from a state. The blessing of an army did not become Christian because it was performed by clergy.

The strength of this method was its insistence that authority remain accountable to truth. Its weakness was that Tolstoy's own moral judgment became the final court of appeal. Traditions that did not fit his conception of rational religion were often excluded before they could be interpreted sympathetically. Reason did not merely evaluate the tradition; it determined in advance what revelation was permitted to contain.

5.4 The Problem of the Canon

Tolstoy's method also unsettled conventional ideas of the biblical canon. He did not regard every passage of Scripture as equally authoritative. Nor did he assume that canonical status guaranteed harmony with the teaching of Jesus. He judged biblical texts according to their agreement with the moral law he believed Christ had revealed.

This approach permitted him to rearrange the Gospels, omit miraculous and theological material, and elevate particular sayings as the authentic center of Christianity. It also made room for his interest in the Didache. Although the Didache was not part of the New Testament canon, Tolstoy could value it highly because its ethical teaching appeared close to the Sermon on the Mount.

His practice therefore produced a functional canon within the canon. Certain teachings governed the interpretation of all others. The command not to resist evil by violence, for example, became a central principle through which he judged church history, political authority, and Christian doctrine.

The difficulty was that the same process could become selective in a way that protected Tolstoy's conclusions from correction. Texts emphasizing resurrection, judgment, sacrament, or divine intervention could be treated as secondary because they did not fit the moral core he had already identified. The canon ceased to challenge the interpreter as a whole and became a collection from which the interpreter extracted confirming evidence.

5.5 Historical Recovery or Modern Reconstruction

The central question is whether Tolstoy recovered primitive Christianity or constructed a modern version of it. The answer is that he did both. He genuinely recovered neglected elements of early Christian life. His emphasis on enemy-love, generosity, simplicity, moral

discipline, and distrust of coercive power stands in real continuity with ancient Christian teaching.

He also exposed the extent to which later Christian societies normalized practices that the earliest teachings of Jesus placed under severe judgment. War, oath-taking, economic inequality, capital punishment, and political domination could not easily be reconciled with the radical demands preserved in the Gospels and the Didache.

At the same time, Tolstoy's primitive Christianity was shaped by nineteenth-century rationalism, moral universalism, suspicion of institutions, and confidence in individual conscience. He separated ethics from sacrament, community, eschatology, and doctrine more sharply than the earliest Christian sources themselves did.

Primitive Christianity therefore served as an idealized mirror in which Tolstoy saw both the failures of the church and the confirmation of his own convictions. His appeal to origins was historically suggestive but theologically selective. It remains valuable not because it reproduced the ancient church in full, but because it forced modern Christianity to confront the possibility that it had preserved the name of Christ while resisting the life he commanded.

6. Jesus, Christology, and the Meaning of the Gospel

Tolstoy's understanding of Jesus lies at the center of both the power and the controversy of his theology. He regarded Jesus as the supreme revealer of the true law of life, the teacher who most clearly expressed the divine demand of love, truthfulness, nonviolence, and self-renunciation. Yet Tolstoy rejected the central Christological claims of historic Christianity. He did not accept that Jesus was the eternal Son of God incarnate, that his death constituted a unique atoning sacrifice, or that his bodily resurrection inaugurated a new creation. The decisive significance of Jesus rested instead in the truth of his teaching and in the exemplary life through which that teaching was embodied.

This reinterpretation transformed the meaning of the gospel. For the churches, the gospel concerned what God had done in and through Jesus Christ. For Tolstoy, it concerned what Jesus taught human beings to do. The difference was not merely one of emphasis. It affected the doctrines of God, salvation, revelation, the cross, resurrection, grace, and the church. Tolstoy's engagement with the Didache is particularly illuminating at this point because the ancient document shares his practical concern while remaining embedded in a communal and theological world broader than his own reconstruction.

6.1 Jesus as Revealer and Teacher of the Law of Life

Tolstoy believed that Jesus disclosed the deepest truth of human existence: a person finds life not through self-preservation, possession, domination, or pleasure, but through participation in the universal law of love. Jesus did not create this law arbitrarily. He revealed the order already present in reality and accessible, at least in part, to reason and conscience.

The authority of Jesus therefore rested on the truthfulness of his teaching. His words could be recognized as true because they resolved the contradiction between selfish desire and the need for meaningful life. The person who lived only for the individual self remained trapped by fear, competition, suffering, and death. The person who lived for God and others entered a form of life not exhausted by personal mortality.

Jesus was unique for Tolstoy because he expressed this truth with incomparable clarity and consistency. He taught love of enemies, renunciation of retaliation, freedom from lust and anger, refusal of oaths, and release from anxious attachment to property and status. These commands were not peripheral counsels for unusually holy persons. They defined the normal content of discipleship.

Tolstoy thus retained a strong sense of Jesus' religious authority while denying traditional explanations of that authority. Jesus was not authoritative because a church declared him divine or because miracles proved his supernatural status. He was authoritative because his teaching revealed the rational and moral law by which human beings ought to live.

6.2 Rejection of Nicene Christology

Tolstoy regarded Nicene Christology as a departure from the simplicity of Jesus' message. The doctrine that Jesus Christ is fully divine and fully human appeared to him as a metaphysical construction imposed upon the gospel by later theologians. Rather than helping people obey Jesus, such doctrine redirected attention from his commandments to speculation about his nature.

He therefore rejected the Trinity, the incarnation in its orthodox form, and the eternal preexistence of Christ. He also denied that belief in these doctrines was necessary for salvation. To require assent to propositions that ordinary people could neither verify nor fully understand seemed incompatible with the universality of divine truth.

Tolstoy believed that the elevation of Jesus into an object of metaphysical worship had practical consequences. Once Christians concentrated on who Jesus was rather than on what he commanded, they could honor him liturgically while disobeying him socially. They could confess his divinity and still participate in war, punishment, exploitation, and political domination.

From the standpoint of historic Christianity, however, Tolstoy misunderstood the purpose of Christology. The creeds were not intended merely to satisfy speculative curiosity. They sought to identify the one encountered in the gospel and worshiped by the church. Traditional theology held that the saving force of Jesus' teaching could not be separated from his identity and from God's action through him.

6.3 The Gospel in Brief and the Reconstructed Jesus

Tolstoy's reconstruction of Jesus is most clearly visible in his treatment of the canonical Gospels. He did not read the four narratives as equally authoritative records to be harmonized without criticism. He rearranged their contents, removed passages he considered secondary or corrupt, and organized the remaining material around a coherent ethical message.

The resulting Jesus speaks with greater unity than the Jesus encountered across the diverse canonical accounts, but that unity is achieved through selection. Miracle stories, birth narratives, apocalyptic sayings, and resurrection accounts are diminished or excluded. Ethical teachings, particularly those associated with the Sermon on the Mount, become the interpretive center.

Tolstoy believed this procedure removed later distortions and recovered the original gospel. Yet his reconstruction also reveals the power of his prior assumptions. He accepted as authentic those elements compatible with rational moral religion and distrusted those that required supernatural belief.

The reconstructed Jesus is therefore both ancient and modern. He speaks in the language of the Gospels, but his message conforms to Tolstoy's conviction that true religion must be rational, universal, practical, and free from mystery. The result is not simply a summary of the canonical Jesus but a theological portrait shaped by a particular understanding of what Jesus ought to have taught.

6.4 Cross, Atonement, and Resurrection

Tolstoy rejected the idea that Jesus' death was a sacrifice required to satisfy divine justice or remove inherited guilt. Such accounts seemed to portray God as demanding suffering before forgiveness could be granted. They also appeared to allow believers to substitute confidence in Christ's sacrifice for actual moral transformation.

The cross retained significance, but primarily as the culmination of Jesus' fidelity to truth and nonviolence. Jesus refused retaliation, accepted suffering, and demonstrated that obedience to love must not be abandoned even under threat of death. The cross was therefore exemplary and revelatory rather than sacrificial in the traditional sense.

Tolstoy treated the resurrection similarly. He did not accept the bodily resurrection as the indispensable historical foundation of Christian faith. Eternal life was understood less as the restoration of the individual body and more as participation in the divine life of love that transcends the isolated self.

This interpretation preserved the moral meaning of Jesus' death while removing the supernatural claims surrounding it. Yet it also altered the structure of Christian hope. In apostolic and creedal Christianity, the resurrection was not merely a symbol of moral truth. It was proclaimed as God's act over death and as the beginning of the renewal of creation.

6.5 The Didache's Presentation of Jesus

The Didache does not provide a developed theory of Christ's nature. In this respect, it may appear to support Tolstoy's claim that earliest Christianity was concerned more with practice than metaphysical doctrine. Jesus is associated with teaching, thanksgiving, knowledge, life, prayer, and the expected coming of the Lord.

Yet the document cannot be reduced to a portrait of Jesus as moral instructor. Baptism is commanded in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Eucharistic prayers give thanks for life and knowledge made known through Jesus. The community understands itself as gathered by God and awaits the return of the Lord.

The Didache therefore combines ethical instruction with worship and eschatological expectation. It does not articulate later conciliar Christology, but neither does it present Jesus merely as a wise human teacher. Jesus belongs within the identity, prayer, initiation, and hope of the community.

This creates a significant tension for Tolstoy's use of the text. The Didache supports his claim that discipleship requires concrete obedience. It does not clearly support his separation of that obedience from communal confession, ritual practice, and expectation of divine intervention.

6.6 Teaching About Jesus and Faith in Jesus

The deepest contrast between Tolstoy and historic Christianity concerns the relationship between the teaching of Jesus and faith in Jesus. Tolstoy feared that faith in Jesus had become a means of avoiding obedience to Jesus. Churches proclaimed salvation through Christ while tolerating conduct directly opposed to his commands.

His criticism retains considerable force. Christian history offers many examples of doctrinal orthodoxy coexisting with violence, greed, nationalism, and oppression. Tolstoy insisted that no confession of Christ could compensate for refusal to follow Christ.

Yet the opposition can be overstated. Historic Christianity did not necessarily understand faith in Christ as an alternative to obedience. At its best, it understood obedience as the fruit of participation in Christ's life, empowered by grace and sustained within a community of worship. Belief about Jesus and fidelity to his teaching were meant to form a single reality.

Tolstoy severed that unity because he believed the doctrinal side had overwhelmed the moral one. His response restored the demands of discipleship but weakened the theological claims that had historically grounded them.

The resulting Christology is therefore both prophetic and reductive. It is prophetic because it recalls Christians to the words of Jesus and exposes the emptiness of worship without obedience. It is reductive because it confines the significance of Jesus largely to moral instruction and example. Tolstoy's gospel asks whether human beings will live as Jesus taught. Historic Christianity asks that question while also asking who Jesus is and what God accomplished through him. The enduring debate concerns whether those questions can finally be separated.

7. The Two Ways, the Sermon on the Mount, and Tolstoyan Ethics

Tolstoy's ethical theology is best understood through the convergence of two traditions: the Two Ways teaching of the Didache and the commandments of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount. Both present moral life as a decisive choice between opposing paths. One way leads toward life through love, truthfulness, mercy, restraint, and service. The other leads toward death through violence, deception, domination, lust, greed, and indifference to suffering.

For Tolstoy, Christianity became intelligible only when this contrast was taken literally. The sayings of Jesus were not poetic exaggerations, impossible ideals, or private counsels for saints. They were practical commandments intended to govern ordinary life. The tragedy of Christian history, in his judgment, was that churches had praised these commands while constructing moral exceptions that allowed believers to ignore them.

The Didache reinforced Tolstoy's conviction that the earliest Christians understood discipleship as a disciplined way of life. Yet it also complicates his interpretation. The ancient text places moral formation within a community of teaching, worship, correction, and expectation. Tolstoy accepted its ethical radicalism but relocated moral authority primarily within individual reason and conscience.

7.1 The Way of Life as Practical Christianity

The Didache begins not with an abstract definition of God but with a choice between the Way of Life and the Way of Death. This structure closely matches Tolstoy's insistence that religion

concerns the direction of a person's whole life. Faith is not simply possession of correct ideas. It is movement along one path rather than another.

The Way of Life is defined through actions and dispositions. The disciple loves God, loves the neighbor, blesses enemies, gives to those in need, controls anger, rejects deceit, and refuses exploitation. The Way of Death is marked by murder, greed, cruelty, arrogance, falsehood, and hostility toward the poor.

Tolstoy interpreted such teaching as evidence that primitive Christianity was practical before it became dogmatic. The central religious question was not whether a person could formulate the nature of Christ correctly, but whether the person lived according to the law Christ taught.

This practical orientation also made Christianity universal. A complex theology might divide educated specialists from ordinary believers, but a command to love, forgive, and speak truthfully could be understood by anyone. Its difficulty lay not in intellectual comprehension but in obedience.

Tolstoy therefore rejected interpretations that treated the commands of Jesus as symbolic ideals. If the Way of Life could not actually be followed, then Christianity became a religion of admiration without transformation. The disciple would praise the path while continuing to travel in the opposite direction.

7.2 Love of God and Love of Neighbor

The Way of Life begins with love of God and love of neighbor. Tolstoy understood these commandments as inseparable. Love of God was not primarily an emotion directed toward an invisible being. It was participation in the divine law of life, and that participation became visible in one's treatment of others.

To love the neighbor meant more than affection toward family, friends, or members of one's own community. Jesus extended love beyond the boundaries of reciprocity. The disciple was commanded to love those who offered no advantage in return and even those who acted as enemies.

Tolstoy regarded this extension as the decisive test of Christianity. Most social systems were based on selective love. Nations encouraged citizens to love compatriots while treating foreigners as threats. Governments praised order while punishing enemies. Churches preached charity while blessing military conflict. Such love remained governed by division.

Enemy-love broke that pattern. It denied that hostility could cancel the moral claim of another person. The enemy remained a bearer of the same divine life and could not be reduced to an obstacle or target.

This principle also shaped Tolstoy's social ethics. Love of neighbor required attention to hunger, poverty, labor, and inequality. It could not remain a private sentiment. A person who lived in luxury while others lacked necessities participated in a structure contrary to love, even without committing an obvious act of violence.

7.3 Anger, Reconciliation, and the Prohibition of Contempt

Both the Sermon on the Mount and the Didache trace violence back to anger. Tolstoy emphasized this movement from outward action to inward disposition. Murder does not begin with the physical act alone. It begins when another person is treated with contempt, reduced to an enemy, or judged unworthy of love.

Anger was therefore not a harmless private feeling. It prepared the imagination for violence. It justified retaliation, hardened social divisions, and made coercion appear necessary. Tolstoy did not deny that human beings experience anger. He denied that anger could be granted moral authority.

Reconciliation became a central religious obligation. The person who seeks God while refusing peace with another lives in contradiction. Religious worship cannot compensate for hatred, humiliation, or unresolved injury.

Tolstoy's position was demanding because it placed responsibility upon the offended person as well as the offender. One must not retaliate, nurse resentment, or wait for the enemy to become worthy of forgiveness. The cycle of injury ends only when someone refuses to continue it.

Critics may object that such teaching can become passive in the face of abuse or injustice. Tolstoy's response was that nonretaliation does not require approval of evil. One may confront falsehood, refuse cooperation, and expose injustice. What one may not do is convert moral opposition into hatred or violence.

7.4 Sexual Desire, Marriage, and Moral Discipline

Tolstoy's treatment of sexuality was among the most severe aspects of his ethics. He interpreted Jesus' teaching on adultery as a demand to confront desire at its inward source. Sexual wrongdoing began not only in external acts but in the reduction of another person to an object of appetite.

This concern reflected his broader suspicion of pleasure when separated from moral responsibility. Desire could become a form of domination, drawing another person into the service of the self. Chastity therefore meant more than legal fidelity. It required purification of intention and freedom from possessiveness.

Tolstoy's later writings sometimes approached an ascetic distrust of sexuality itself. He struggled to reconcile marriage, procreation, affection, and bodily desire with his ideal of self-renunciation. This produced tensions in both his theology and his personal life.

The Didache also places sexual conduct within the Way of Life and condemns adultery, exploitation, and corrupt desire. Yet it does not develop the same broad suspicion of sexuality found in some of Tolstoy's writings. Its concern is moral discipline within communal life rather than the near-elimination of sexual desire.

Tolstoy's strength was his insistence that sexuality must be judged by love, truthfulness, responsibility, and respect for the other. His weakness was a tendency to treat bodily desire primarily as a threat rather than as a dimension of human life capable of moral ordering.

7.5 Oaths, Truthfulness, and Divided Loyalties

Tolstoy interpreted Jesus' prohibition of oaths as a direct challenge to political and legal institutions. An oath divides speech into two categories: ordinary statements, which may be unreliable, and solemn statements guaranteed by a special formula. Jesus instead required constant truthfulness.

The issue extended beyond personal honesty. Oaths bound individuals to governments, courts, armies, and offices. A soldier swore obedience before knowing what actions might later be commanded. A public official pledged loyalty to an institution that might require injustice. Tolstoy believed such promises transferred moral responsibility from conscience to authority.

No person, in his view, could promise unconditional obedience to another human being. Loyalty to truth and love had to remain higher than loyalty to state, nation, church, or ruler. Any oath that required future wrongdoing was invalid from the beginning.

This teaching threatened the foundations of organized power. Governments depended upon officials and soldiers who would obey commands consistently. Tolstoy therefore saw oath-taking as one of the mechanisms by which ordinary people became participants in violence they might otherwise reject.

Truthfulness also required resistance to propaganda, patriotic mythology, and religious hypocrisy. A society maintained by false descriptions of war, punishment, and privilege could not be reformed without people willing to name those realities honestly.

7.6 Generosity, Property, and Care for the Poor

The Didache and the teachings of Jesus place generosity near the center of the Way of Life. Tolstoy interpreted this demand as a challenge to private accumulation and social inequality.

Possessions could not be treated as morally neutral when others lacked food, shelter, or security.

Giving was not simply an optional expression of kindness. It recognized that material goods are received within a shared human world. The need of another person creates a moral claim upon what one possesses.

Tolstoy's critique extended beyond almsgiving. Charity could ease suffering while leaving the structures that produced poverty untouched. A wealthy person might donate a small portion of income while continuing to benefit from exploitative labor, inherited privilege, or unequal ownership.

He therefore emphasized simple living, manual labor, and reduction of unnecessary consumption. The moral question was not only how much one gave, but whether one's manner of life depended upon the burdens placed on others.

The Didache combines generosity with discernment. It commands giving while warning against exploitation of the community's resources. Tolstoy likewise opposed sentimental charity detached from truth. Yet he feared that appeals to prudence often became excuses for withholding help.

Care for the poor was ultimately a test of whether love had become material. A religion that celebrated spiritual truths while tolerating degrading poverty remained divided against itself.

7.7 Moral Perfection and the Problem of Attainability

Tolstoy's interpretation of the commandments raises an unavoidable question: can such an ethic actually be lived? Enemy-love, nonresistance, purity of desire, radical truthfulness, and economic renunciation appear beyond ordinary human capacity.

Traditional Christian interpretation has often treated these teachings as goals toward which believers grow under grace. Other interpretations have distinguished personal morality from public responsibility or presented the Sermon on the Mount as an ideal exposing humanity's need for forgiveness.

Tolstoy rejected approaches that weakened the immediate authority of the commands. Their difficulty did not make them optional. Moral progress began only when a person ceased inventing exceptions and admitted what the teaching required.

He did not necessarily claim that disciples would achieve complete perfection at once. Rather, the command established the direction of life. A traveler may not yet have reached the destination, but progress is impossible while traveling deliberately away from it.

This distinction allowed Tolstoy to combine moral absolutism with gradual transformation. The standard remained uncompromised, while actual persons struggled toward it. Failure called for repentance and renewed effort, not theological justification of the failure.

The danger in this approach is moral exhaustion. Without a developed doctrine of grace, human weakness can appear merely as insufficient effort. Tolstoy's ethics may inspire heroic responsibility, but they can also produce guilt, severity, and judgment.

Its enduring force lies in the refusal to make Christianity harmless. Tolstoy read the Two Ways and the Sermon on the Mount as demands upon actual conduct. He may have underestimated the theological and communal resources needed to sustain that conduct, but he recognized that a faith unwilling to alter anger, sexuality, speech, possessions, and relations with enemies had ceased to function as a way of life.

8. Nonresistance, Political Violence, and Christian Anarchism

Tolstoy's doctrine of nonresistance was the point at which his reading of Jesus became a direct challenge to the political order. He did not treat nonviolence as a private virtue, an exceptional vocation, or a strategy to be used only when convenient. He understood it as a universal command arising from the law of love. Because every state ultimately depended upon coercion, punishment, military force, and the threat of violence, Tolstoy concluded that Christian discipleship placed the believer in permanent tension with political authority.

His position is often described as Christian anarchism, although Tolstoy himself was less concerned with constructing an anarchist theory than with exposing the contradiction between the teachings of Jesus and the institutions of organized violence. He did not advocate chaos, disorder, or violent revolution. He argued instead that social transformation must begin when individuals refuse to participate in systems that require them to kill, punish, deceive, dominate, or surrender conscience to authority.

The Didache strengthened this interpretation by preserving commands of enemy-love, nonretaliation, generosity, and moral separation from the Way of Death. Yet Tolstoy extended those commands into a systematic critique of armies, courts, prisons, patriotism, and government. In doing so, he transformed early Christian moral instruction into a comprehensive political theology of conscientious refusal.

8.1 The Command Not to Resist Evil by Violence

Tolstoy regarded the command not to resist evil as one of the clearest and most frequently evaded teachings of Jesus. He believed that Christian interpreters had surrounded it with qualifications until it no longer threatened ordinary social life. It was treated as an ideal of

personal patience while governments, churches, and citizens continued to authorize war, execution, imprisonment, and violent self-defense.

For Tolstoy, the command did not mean that evil should be ignored. It meant that evil must not be opposed by methods that reproduce it. Violence may suppress a particular offender, but it does so through fear, injury, and domination. It therefore establishes the same moral principle it claims to defeat: that superior force grants the right to compel another person.

Nonresistance was not indifference. Tolstoy distinguished moral refusal from passive submission. A person could speak truth, expose injustice, refuse cooperation, protect the vulnerable through nonviolent means, and accept suffering rather than obey an evil command. What one could not do was intentionally injure or kill another person in the name of justice.

This teaching rested on Tolstoy's understanding of human fallibility. No individual or government possesses complete knowledge of another person's guilt or of the consequences of coercive action. Violence assumes a certainty and moral superiority that human beings do not possess. The Christian response to evil must therefore combine resistance to falsehood with refusal to destroy the wrongdoer.

8.2 Enemy-Love as a Social Principle

Tolstoy rejected the confinement of enemy-love to private relationships. He believed that Jesus' command had direct consequences for relations among classes, nations, religions, and political communities. If the enemy remained a neighbor, then no institution could exempt Christians from the obligation to love.

Modern states depended upon the opposite principle. They divided humanity into citizens and foreigners, allies and enemies, lawful persons and criminals. Patriotism trained people to regard loyalty to the nation as a supreme virtue, even when national interest required killing strangers who had committed no personal wrong against them.

Tolstoy saw this as a moral contradiction. A person might be kind in private life yet become willing to kill when the state reclassified another human being as an enemy. Political language made violence appear abstract, necessary, and honorable. Enemy-love dissolved that abstraction by restoring the individuality and humanity of the person across the border or behind the label of criminal.

As a social principle, enemy-love also challenged class hostility. Tolstoy opposed both aristocratic domination and revolutionary hatred. The oppressed could resist exploitation, but they could not create justice through revenge. Hatred of the oppressor reproduced the logic of domination even when expressed in the language of liberation.

8.3 War, Military Service, and Patriotic Religion

Tolstoy considered military service one of the clearest examples of institutionalized moral surrender. The soldier was trained to obey commands, suppress personal judgment, and kill persons designated as enemies by authorities he might never meet. Military discipline therefore required the transfer of conscience from the individual to the state.

He rejected the argument that defensive war was morally different from aggression. Each government described its own violence as defensive, necessary, or just. Ordinary soldiers on opposing sides could be persuaded that they were protecting home, family, and civilization. The language of defense thus allowed both sides to participate in the same act while believing themselves righteous.

Tolstoy also condemned patriotic religion. When churches blessed armies, prayed for victory, or celebrated national military power, they placed collective loyalty above the universal law of love. The same Christ was invoked by opposing armies, each asking divine support for the destruction of the other.

For Tolstoy, this revealed the depth of Christianity's corruption by the state. The crucified teacher of enemy-love had been transformed into the patron of national violence. Religious ceremonies softened the moral reality of war by surrounding killing with sacred language, symbols, and public honor.

Conscientious objection therefore became an essential Christian witness. Refusal of military service exposed the false claim that killing could become righteous through command, uniform, or national necessity.

8.4 Courts, Prisons, Punishment, and Execution

Tolstoy extended his critique of violence beyond war to the legal system. Courts claimed to administer justice, but they ultimately relied upon coercion. Judgments were enforced through police power, imprisonment, confiscation, and, in some societies, execution.

He regarded punishment as organized retaliation. Even when described as deterrence or rehabilitation, it often inflicted suffering upon persons already shaped by poverty, ignorance, abuse, and social inequality. The state judged offenders without accepting responsibility for the conditions that contributed to their actions.

Capital punishment represented the contradiction in its starkest form. Society condemned killing by performing a deliberate killing under legal authority. Tolstoy believed that no procedure, uniform, or judicial sentence could transform the taking of life into an act of love.

Prisons also illustrated the moral distance created by institutions. Citizens who would not personally confine or injure another person supported systems that performed those actions on their behalf. Bureaucracy divided responsibility among judges, guards, officials, and lawmakers until no single participant felt accountable for the whole.

Tolstoy did not deny the reality of harmful behavior. He questioned whether punishment healed the offender, restored the victim, or reduced the deeper causes of crime. He favored moral persuasion, reconciliation, material reform, and nonviolent forms of protection over retribution.

8.5 The State as Organized Violence

Tolstoy's critique led him to a radical conclusion: the state was not a neutral institution occasionally misused by violent rulers. Coercion belonged to its basic structure. Laws became effective because disobedience eventually met force.

Taxation, conscription, property enforcement, policing, imprisonment, and territorial control all depended upon the threat of compulsion. Even peaceful citizens participated indirectly by funding, legitimating, or obeying institutions that acted violently in their name.

This did not mean that every action of government was equally evil. Tolstoy recognized that states built roads, organized services, and maintained forms of order. His argument was that these benefits did not erase the coercive foundation upon which governmental authority rested.

He therefore rejected the belief that moral society could be created through better rulers alone. A benevolent government still claimed the right to command obedience and punish refusal. The problem was structural, not merely personal.

Christian anarchism followed from this analysis. If the believer owed ultimate loyalty to the law of love, then no state could possess absolute moral authority. Obedience remained conditional. When political commands required violence or falsehood, refusal became a religious duty.

8.6 Rejection of Violent Revolution

Tolstoy's hostility to the state did not make him an advocate of revolutionary violence. He condemned assassination, terrorism, armed uprising, and class revenge. A revolution that seized power through killing would inherit the moral logic of the regime it overthrew.

Violent revolution promised liberation but depended upon the same instruments of coercion: secrecy, discipline, force, punishment, and fear. Once victorious, revolutionaries would need armies, police, prisons, and executions to preserve the new order. The names of rulers might change while domination continued.

Tolstoy believed that means and ends could not be separated. Justice could not be created through injustice, peace through killing, or freedom through terror. Every method already contained the form of the society it would produce.

This position distinguished him from revolutionary anarchists and socialists who regarded violence as necessary against oppressive systems. Tolstoy shared their condemnation of exploitation and hierarchy but rejected their confidence that coercion could serve emancipation.

His alternative appeared slow and impractical to many critics. Yet he believed that violent revolutions failed precisely because they changed institutions without transforming the moral habits that sustained domination.

8.7 Conscientious Withdrawal and Social Transformation

Tolstoy's political strategy centered on refusal of cooperation. Governments and violent institutions survived because ordinary people served in armies, paid taxes, enforced laws, administered prisons, accepted oaths, repeated propaganda, and treated authority as morally binding.

If individuals withdrew their participation, the machinery of coercion would weaken. This withdrawal did not require a centralized revolutionary party. It began wherever a person refused to kill, imprison, deceive, exploit, or obey an unjust command.

Tolstoy's approach placed enormous responsibility upon conscience. No one could excuse wrongdoing by claiming to have followed orders or fulfilled a public duty. Institutions acted only through persons, and each person remained morally accountable.

Such refusal could involve suffering. The conscientious objector might face imprisonment, poverty, social rejection, or death. Tolstoy did not promise that nonviolence would produce immediate success. Its truth did not depend upon favorable consequences. The disciple obeyed because violence was wrong, not because nonviolence guaranteed safety.

At the same time, Tolstoy believed that moral witness possessed social power. A person who accepted suffering rather than inflict it exposed the hidden violence of the system. Voluntary sacrifice could awaken conscience in others and reveal that authority depended upon consent more than it admitted.

His political theology therefore joined personal transformation with structural critique. Society would not become peaceful merely through inward spirituality, yet institutions would not become just without transformed individuals. The revolution Tolstoy envisioned began in conscience and spread through collective noncooperation.

The enduring significance of his Christian anarchism lies in this refusal to separate private morality from public action. Tolstoy insisted that the teachings of Jesus applied wherever human beings exercised power over one another. His conclusions may appear uncompromising, but they forced Christianity to confront a question it had often avoided: whether love of enemies can remain central to the gospel while violence remains central to Christian civilization.

9. Church, Sacrament, and Ecclesial Authority

Tolstoy's conflict with institutional Christianity was not a secondary consequence of his theology. It arose directly from his understanding of the gospel. If Christianity consisted above all in obedience to the teachings of Jesus, then every church had to be judged by the life it produced and the social order it supported. No claim to apostolic succession, doctrinal orthodoxy, or sacramental authority could exempt an institution from that judgment.

Tolstoy believed that the historic churches had preserved the language of Christianity while repeatedly contradicting its moral substance. They preached humility while participating in systems of privilege, proclaimed love of enemies while blessing armies, and honored the crucified Christ while supporting punishment and execution. The church had become, in his view, an institution that mediated between the believer and God while weakening the direct authority of Jesus' commandments.

The Didache complicates this criticism. It strongly supports Tolstoy's insistence that Christian faith must be embodied in conduct, but it also portrays primitive Christianity as unmistakably communal, ritual, ordered, and disciplinary. Baptism, fasting, prayer, Eucharistic thanksgiving, prophetic discernment, and recognized ministry are not later additions imposed upon an originally individual moral philosophy. They already belong to one of the earliest surviving descriptions of Christian life. The question is therefore not whether primitive Christianity possessed ecclesial forms, but how those forms related to ethical obedience and whether Tolstoy's rejection of institutional religion could account for that relationship.

9.1 Tolstoy's Indictment of Institutional Christianity

Tolstoy's criticism of the church rested on a distinction between the teaching of Christ and the religion constructed around Christ. He believed that Jesus had proclaimed a simple and universal law of love, but that churches had replaced this teaching with doctrines, ceremonies, and systems of authority. Instead of asking whether Christians loved enemies, rejected violence, spoke truthfully, and shared their possessions, ecclesiastical institutions asked whether they accepted approved creeds and participated in prescribed rites.

This substitution was morally dangerous because ritual and doctrine could create the appearance of faithfulness without requiring transformation. A person could receive the sacraments, confess orthodox belief, and remain fully integrated into a violent and unequal social order. Religious observance could therefore become not merely insufficient but deceptive. It reassured believers that they belonged to Christ while permitting them to disregard his commands.

Tolstoy was especially disturbed by the church's alliance with the state. Clergy blessed rulers, armies, courts, and national ambitions. Political authorities, in turn, protected the institutional church and reinforced its public authority. Each legitimized the other. The state presented coercion as divinely sanctioned, while the church received status, property, and influence.

In Tolstoy's judgment, this alliance reversed the position of early Christianity. A movement that had once challenged imperial violence had become one of its ceremonial supports. The cross, originally a sign of suffering under state power, could be carried by armies acting in the name of Christian nations.

His indictment was therefore both theological and political. The church had not merely taught mistaken doctrines. It had helped conceal violence beneath sacred language. Tolstoy believed that recovery of Christianity required liberation from this institutional arrangement.

9.2 Conflict with the Russian Orthodox Church

Tolstoy's conflict with the Russian Orthodox Church developed gradually as his religious conclusions became public. He had attempted for a period to participate seriously in Orthodox worship and discipline, hoping that inherited faith might resolve his spiritual crisis. Yet he increasingly found himself unable to affirm doctrines and practices that he considered irrational or morally contradictory.

He rejected the Trinity, the divinity of Christ in the Nicene sense, the virgin birth, miracles, sacramental mediation, and bodily resurrection. He also criticized the church's association with monarchy, warfare, social hierarchy, and legal punishment. These were not minor disagreements within a shared theological framework. They challenged the doctrinal and institutional foundations of Orthodoxy.

The formal declaration that Tolstoy had placed himself outside the church was therefore unsurprising. From the church's perspective, he continued to use Christian language while denying essential Christian beliefs. From Tolstoy's perspective, the church had excluded itself from the teaching of Christ by defending dogma and coercive power.

The conflict revealed two competing definitions of Christian identity. Orthodoxy understood the faith through the inseparable unity of doctrine, sacrament, worship, and ecclesial communion.

Tolstoy defined it through moral obedience to Jesus. The church asked whether he confessed the Christ proclaimed in its creeds. Tolstoy asked whether the church obeyed the Jesus whose commandments it recited.

Neither side regarded the disagreement as merely academic. The dispute concerned who possessed the authority to define Christianity. Tolstoy denied that an institution could claim such authority while violating the moral law of Christ. The church denied that an individual interpreter could reconstruct Christianity by rejecting its central doctrines and sacramental life.

9.3 Baptism in the Didache

The Didache's treatment of baptism presents a direct challenge to any attempt to describe earliest Christianity as nonritual or purely ethical. Baptism follows the Two Ways instruction and marks entry into the community. Moral teaching prepares the candidate, but initiation includes a specific act performed with water and a Trinitarian formula.

The document displays both structure and flexibility. Flowing water is preferred, but other water may be used. Immersion appears desirable, but pouring is permitted when conditions require it. The form is stable, while its administration is adapted to circumstance. This suggests that ritual was not viewed as empty formalism. It was a meaningful communal act whose essential purpose could survive practical variation.

For historic Christianity, baptism signifies more than public agreement with moral principles. It represents incorporation into Christ, forgiveness, new life, and entrance into the church. The Didache does not offer a systematic baptismal theology, but it clearly assumes that Christian identity has a ritual and communal beginning.

Tolstoy could interpret baptism symbolically as a declaration of commitment to the teaching of Jesus. What he could not easily accept was the claim that the rite communicated grace or that ecclesiastical administration of baptism possessed saving significance. In his theology, moral transformation was primary, and ritual could have value only insofar as it expressed that transformation.

The difficulty is that the Didache does not oppose baptism to ethical life. It connects them. The candidate is taught the Way of Life and then baptized into a worshiping community. Primitive Christianity appears neither as ritual without morality nor as morality without ritual.

9.4 Fasting and Fixed Prayer

The Didache also prescribes regular fasting and repeated prayer. These practices reveal that early Christian spirituality was shaped by communal rhythms rather than by spontaneous moral intuition alone. Believers were instructed not only what to value but how to order their days and weeks.

Fasting disciplined bodily desire and distinguished the Christian community from surrounding religious groups. Its significance was both personal and communal. The individual learned restraint, while the community embodied a shared identity through common practice.

The instruction to pray the Lord's Prayer repeatedly each day is equally important. Prayer was not confined to private inspiration. A received form was memorized and repeated. The words of Jesus became part of the believer's daily pattern of attention, dependence, forgiveness, and hope.

Tolstoy valued prayer when it awakened conscience and directed a person toward the law of love. He opposed prayer used as magical petition, public display, or substitute for action. A person who prayed for peace while supporting war lived in contradiction.

He could therefore appreciate disciplined prayer and fasting as aids to moral transformation. Yet he remained suspicious of their institutional regulation. Once practices were prescribed by clergy, they could become measures of religious conformity rather than instruments of spiritual life.

The Didache suggests that the problem is not fixed practice itself but the separation of practice from its ethical purpose. Fasting, prayer, and moral conduct belong together. Ritual discipline is intended to form the person who walks in the Way of Life.

9.5 Eucharistic Thanksgiving and Sacred Community

The Eucharistic prayers of the Didache present one of the most significant obstacles to Tolstoy's reduction of primitive Christianity to ethical teaching. They reveal a community gathered in thanksgiving, conscious of divine gifts, united through a sacred meal, and oriented toward the future gathering of God's people.

The prayers give thanks for life, knowledge, creation, nourishment, and the revelation received through Jesus. They also use imagery of scattered grain gathered into one loaf, expressing a vision of the church as a people drawn from dispersion into unity.

This communal symbolism is difficult to reduce to private moral conviction. The meal forms and expresses a corporate identity. Believers do not merely agree individually with the commandments of Jesus; they assemble, give thanks, share, remember, and hope together.

Tolstoy strongly criticized sacramental claims that appeared to locate divine grace in priestly actions or material elements. He regarded elaborate Eucharistic doctrine as an example of how churches shifted attention from moral obedience to supernatural ritual. A person could participate in communion while remaining unrepentant, violent, or exploitative.

His criticism identifies a genuine danger. Sacramental participation can become formal and morally complacent. Yet the Didache suggests another possibility: Eucharistic practice may strengthen rather than replace ethical community. Thanksgiving, unity, generosity, reconciliation, and expectation can be enacted in a shared meal.

The theological question is therefore whether sacrament competes with discipleship or sustains it. Tolstoy tended toward the first conclusion because he observed ritual functioning without moral transformation. The Didache offers evidence for the second by presenting worship as part of the same communal life shaped by the Two Ways.

9.6 Bishops, Deacons, Prophets, and Communal Order

The Didache reflects a period in which charismatic and local forms of leadership coexisted. Traveling apostles and prophets were welcomed, but their claims had to be tested. Bishops and deacons were appointed within local communities and were to be respected.

This arrangement demonstrates that primitive Christianity possessed authority structures, though not yet in the highly developed form of later centuries. Community life required teaching, discernment, hospitality, worship, administration, and discipline. These functions could not be sustained by isolated individuals acting solely according to private conscience.

The document's treatment of prophets is especially relevant to Tolstoy's criticism of clergy. Spiritual authority is tested by conduct. A prophet who seeks money, exploits hospitality, or fails to live according to the teaching exposes himself as false. Office or charisma does not place anyone beyond moral judgment.

Tolstoy would have welcomed this principle. He consistently judged religious teachers by the lives they led and the social systems they supported. Clergy who preached Christ while blessing violence forfeited moral authority.

Yet the Didache does not conclude that all offices should be abolished. It seeks trustworthy leaders rather than leaderless religion. Authority is necessary but accountable. The community must discern, appoint, and correct.

Tolstoy's suspicion of hierarchy arose from the ease with which office could become domination. He feared that religious institutions trained believers to surrender conscience to priests as political institutions trained citizens to surrender conscience to rulers. The Didache confirms the need for vigilance but does not support complete ecclesial individualism.

9.7 Can Primitive Christianity Be Separated from the Church?

Tolstoy's use of the Didache raises a fundamental question: can primitive Christian ethics be detached from the worshiping and ordered community that preserved them? Tolstoy often

treated church, sacrament, and doctrine as later coverings placed over the original moral teaching of Jesus. The Didache suggests that the relationship was more integrated from an early stage.

The same document that commands enemy-love also directs baptism. The same community that condemns greed shares Eucharistic thanksgiving. The same believers who walk in the Way of Life appoint ministers, test prophets, pray fixed prayers, and await the coming of the Lord. Ethics, ritual, authority, and eschatology belong to a single communal pattern.

This does not vindicate every later ecclesiastical development. The Didache offers no support for unquestionable clerical power, coercive conversion, national churches, or alliance with military authority. Its leaders remain accountable to moral truth, and its structures are comparatively simple.

Nevertheless, it challenges the idea that Christianity can be reduced to individual obedience governed by reason alone. The commands of Jesus require interpretation, formation, correction, mutual support, and shared memory. A community is needed not merely to preserve doctrines but to sustain practices that resist the surrounding culture.

Tolstoy was right to insist that the church must be judged by the gospel. He was also right that sacrament and office can become instruments of hypocrisy and power. Yet his theology left insufficient room for the church as a community of formation rather than merely an institution of control.

The Didache points toward a more balanced judgment. Primitive Christianity was ecclesial, but its ecclesial life was subordinate to the Way of Life. Its rituals did not excuse disobedience; they gave communal form to discipleship. Its leaders did not replace conscience; they were tested by conduct. Its worship did not withdraw believers from the world; it trained them to live as a distinct people within it.

Tolstoy's critique therefore remains indispensable but incomplete. He exposed the corruption of church authority when it becomes allied with violence, privilege, and falsehood. The Didache reveals that the answer may not be the elimination of church, sacrament, and ministry, but their reformation according to the ethical demands that gave them meaning.

10. Salvation, Grace, Resurrection, and the Kingdom of God

Tolstoy's theology of salvation arose from the same existential question that initiated his religious crisis: how can human life possess meaning when the individual self is subject to suffering, failure, and death? His answer did not depend upon sacramental absolution, substitutionary atonement, or confidence in a future bodily resurrection. Salvation meant

awakening from the isolated life of egoism and entering the universal life of love. A person was saved by ceasing to live solely for personal desire and by aligning thought and conduct with the divine law revealed through Jesus.

This account gave salvation an immediate ethical form. It concerned the transformation of anger, fear, sexuality, possessions, social relations, and participation in violence. Tolstoy refused to separate salvation from the actual manner in which a person lived. Yet his interpretation also diminished themes central to historic Christianity: divine initiative, reconciliation through Christ, the work of grace, resurrection of the body, and the future consummation of creation.

The Didache again illuminates both continuity and tension. It presents salvation as a choice between the Way of Life and the Way of Death, but it also situates that choice within baptism, prayer, communal worship, watchfulness, judgment, resurrection, and expectation of the Lord's coming. Tolstoy accepted the urgency of moral transformation while interpreting the supernatural and eschatological framework in substantially different terms.

10.1 Salvation as Moral Awakening

Tolstoy did not understand salvation primarily as rescue from punishment after death. Nor did he regard it as a legal change in status produced by accepting doctrines concerning Christ. Salvation was a change in consciousness and direction. The individual awakened from the illusion that personal satisfaction, social advancement, or physical survival could provide ultimate meaning.

The unsaved life was governed by the separate self. It sought pleasure, security, property, recognition, and power. Because these goods were temporary and vulnerable, such a life remained dominated by anxiety. The more a person attempted to preserve the self, the more clearly death revealed the impossibility of the project.

Salvation began when the individual recognized that true life did not belong to the isolated ego. Meaning emerged through participation in the life of God, understood as truth, love, reason, and service. The person who lived for others entered a reality larger than biological existence.

This awakening was moral because it changed conduct. Love of God became love of neighbor. Freedom from the self became generosity, forgiveness, truthfulness, nonresistance, and simplicity. Salvation could not remain an inward feeling without visible consequences.

Tolstoy's account therefore united existential meaning and ethical responsibility. The same movement that overcame despair also challenged violence and privilege. A person no longer had to defend the isolated self at all costs and could therefore refuse retaliation, relinquish unnecessary possessions, and accept suffering rather than injure another.

10.2 Repentance as Transformation of Life

Repentance, for Tolstoy, meant a genuine change in the direction of life. It was not satisfied by remorse, confession, or ritual absolution. A person who acknowledged wrongdoing but continued to participate in the same patterns of violence, exploitation, or deception had not truly repented.

This emphasis followed directly from his interpretation of Jesus. The call to repentance announced the possibility of a new life governed by the Kingdom of God. It did not merely invite people to feel sorrow for past sins or to trust that punishment had been removed.

Tolstoy was especially critical of religious systems that appeared to separate forgiveness from transformation. Sacramental confession could become a recurring mechanism through which believers obtained reassurance without changing their social conduct. A soldier might confess and return to military service. A wealthy person might receive absolution while continuing to benefit from the labor and deprivation of others.

For Tolstoy, repentance required practical renunciation. One had to stop doing what conscience recognized as evil. The command not to kill required withdrawal from military violence. The command to love the poor required a reconsideration of wealth and property. The command to speak truthfully required refusal of propaganda, false oaths, and institutional deception.

This position preserved the seriousness of repentance but risked identifying it almost entirely with human effort. The penitent person appeared responsible not only for turning toward the good but also for generating the power necessary to remain faithful to it.

10.3 The Diminished Place of Grace

Historic Christianity ordinarily understands salvation as initiated and sustained by divine grace. Human beings do not simply discover the truth and obey it through unaided moral strength. God forgives, heals, empowers, and draws the believer into a new life.

Tolstoy did not entirely eliminate divine assistance, but grace occupies a less developed place in his theology. God's law is present within reason and conscience, and divine life becomes available when the individual renounces egoism. Yet the process is often described as recognition and obedience rather than as supernatural transformation.

This creates a persistent tension. Tolstoy demanded extraordinary moral conduct: love of enemies, refusal of violence, purity of desire, radical truthfulness, simplicity of life, and resistance to social conformity. At the same time, he distrusted the doctrines and sacramental practices through which Christian traditions claimed that believers received strength beyond their own capacities.

The result can appear morally heroic but spiritually severe. Failure is explained primarily by ignorance, self-deception, cowardice, or unwillingness to obey. Less attention is given to the bondage of the will, the persistence of destructive desire, and the need for divine healing.

Tolstoy's criticism of grace was directed less against divine mercy than against its misuse. He feared that believers invoked grace to excuse disobedience. Yet in resisting cheap grace, he risked leaving insufficient room for grace as the power by which obedience becomes possible.

10.4 Rejection of Substitutionary and Sacrificial Atonement

Tolstoy rejected accounts of atonement in which Jesus' death satisfied divine justice, bore the punishment deserved by humanity, or functioned as a sacrificial payment for sin. Such interpretations appeared to him morally incoherent. A just God would not require the suffering of an innocent person before forgiving the guilty.

He also feared that substitutionary interpretations weakened ethical responsibility. If salvation depended upon believing that Christ had already paid the penalty for sin, then believers might place confidence in his suffering rather than changing their own lives.

Tolstoy did not regard the cross as meaningless. It revealed Jesus' complete fidelity to the law of love. Faced with betrayal, humiliation, political violence, and death, Jesus refused retaliation. His suffering demonstrated the cost of truth in a world organized by coercion.

The cross therefore became exemplary and revelatory. It showed how a person should confront evil and exposed the violence of political and religious authority. Jesus saved by teaching and embodying the path of nonresistant love.

Traditional Christianity would argue that this interpretation is incomplete. The cross is not only an example of human faithfulness but an act of divine reconciliation. Tolstoy preserved its moral challenge while rejecting the claim that something unique and objective occurred between God and humanity through Christ's death.

10.5 Eternal Life and the Fate of the Individual Person

Tolstoy's treatment of eternal life remained closely connected to his struggle with mortality. He rejected crude images of heaven as the endless continuation of the individual personality with its present desires and attachments. Such survival would merely extend the ego rather than overcome its limitations.

Eternal life meant participation in the infinite life of God. The individual discovered that true life did not consist in preserving the separate self but in sharing the universal movement of love. Acts of truth, compassion, and self-renunciation belonged to a reality that death could not render meaningless.

This interpretation allowed Tolstoy to affirm eternal life without committing himself clearly to traditional doctrines of personal resurrection. The biological individual died, but the divine life in which that person participated was not destroyed.

The difficulty concerns personal identity. If salvation culminates in the transcendence of the separate self, what remains of the particular person who loved, suffered, repented, and hoped? Tolstoy's writings do not always provide a consistent answer.

Historic Christianity ordinarily affirms both transformation and continuity. The self is not preserved unchanged, but neither is it dissolved into an impersonal whole. Resurrection promises the redemption of the person as embodied creature. Tolstoy's account offers existential release from fear of death, but it remains less definite concerning the enduring destiny of individual persons.

10.6 The Kingdom of God Within and Among Humanity

The Kingdom of God was the unifying symbol of Tolstoy's mature theology. He rejected interpretations that confined the kingdom to heaven after death or postponed it entirely to a future supernatural event. The kingdom begins when a person recognizes the divine law within and lives according to it.

Its inward character did not make it private. The person transformed by love ceased to participate willingly in violence, falsehood, exploitation, and domination. The kingdom therefore possessed immediate social and political consequences.

Tolstoy envisioned a society transformed not through governmental coercion but through the withdrawal of individuals from evil institutions. Armies would weaken when people refused military service. Punitive systems would weaken when judges, guards, and citizens rejected retaliation. Economic exploitation would weaken when people simplified their lives and refused to profit from the suffering of others.

The kingdom was thus both present and unfinished. It was present wherever love replaced fear and coercion. It remained unfinished because human beings continued to organize society according to self-interest and violence.

Tolstoy's interpretation gave the Kingdom of God practical urgency. It could not be reduced to a future reward that left present institutions untouched. Yet by locating its realization primarily in moral awakening, he risked making the kingdom dependent upon human progress rather than divine action.

10.7 The Didache's Future Resurrection and Judgment

The Didache shares Tolstoy's conviction that faith must produce a distinct way of life. Its contrast between life and death, its demands of generosity and enemy-love, and its warnings against moral corruption strongly support an ethical understanding of salvation.

Yet its final vision moves beyond moral awakening. The community is instructed to watch, persevere, and prepare for the culmination of history. Deception, trial, cosmic signs, resurrection, and the coming of the Lord belong to its expectation.

Judgment gives objective weight to the Two Ways. Human conduct matters not only because love creates a meaningful life but because persons and communities will answer to God. Resurrection also indicates that salvation concerns more than participation in an impersonal moral order. God acts to overcome death and vindicate the faithful.

Tolstoy tended to reinterpret these themes symbolically or ethically. Judgment occurred in the consequences of living contrary to love. Resurrection became the triumph of spiritual life over attachment to the mortal self. The coming of the Kingdom took place through transformed consciousness and conduct.

Such interpretations preserve moral significance but alter the Didache's eschatological structure. The ancient community did not merely expect the gradual spread of enlightened ethics. It awaited an event in which God would complete what human obedience could not accomplish.

The tension reveals the central difference between Tolstoyan salvation and early Christian hope. Tolstoy placed the decisive movement within the person's recognition and practice of the law of love. The Didache placed moral obedience within a larger drama of divine promise, communal preparation, resurrection, and judgment.

Tolstoy's theology remains compelling because it refuses to separate salvation from life as it is actually lived. It demands that claims about God become visible in relations with enemies, the poor, the state, and the church. Yet its moral clarity is purchased partly by narrowing the traditional meaning of grace, atonement, resurrection, and eschatological hope. Salvation becomes the discovery of the true way of life, but less clearly the act by which God reconciles, raises, and renews creation.

11. Selective Retrieval or Faithful Recovery? A Critical Assessment

Tolstoy's engagement with the Didache forces a final evaluative question: did he recover primitive Christianity, or did he use an ancient text to authorize a modern religious program?

The evidence resists a simple answer. His interpretation was selective, but selection does not necessarily imply falsification. Every act of reception emphasizes certain features, draws connections, and applies an inherited text to new circumstances. Tolstoy genuinely perceived dimensions of early Christianity that institutional churches had often neglected. At the same time, his theological assumptions governed what he was prepared to recognize as authentic.

His appropriation of the Didache should therefore be judged neither as a faithful reproduction of the early church nor as an arbitrary misuse of antiquity. It was a morally serious retrieval shaped by a powerful but restrictive hermeneutic. Tolstoy recovered the radical ethical demands of primitive Christianity with unusual clarity, yet he separated those demands from much of the theological, sacramental, ecclesial, and eschatological world in which they originally functioned.

The resulting theology remains difficult to dismiss. Its limitations do not cancel its prophetic force, and its prophetic force does not remove its limitations. Tolstoy compels Christian theology to ask whether doctrinal continuity without obedience can still be called faithfulness. The Didache, in turn, compels Tolstoyan theology to ask whether Christian obedience can be sustained after being detached from worship, grace, community, resurrection, and the person of Christ.

11.1 Genuine Continuities with the Didache

Tolstoy's reading of the Didache rests upon real and substantial continuities. The document does present Christianity as a way of life. Its opening contrast between the Way of Life and the Way of Death gives moral conduct a foundational place. Love of God and neighbor, generosity, restraint of anger, truthful speech, care for the poor, purity of conduct, and rejection of exploitation are not marginal concerns. They form the entrance into Christian existence.

Tolstoy was therefore correct to resist interpretations of primitive Christianity that reduced it to ritual, institutional succession, or doctrinal formulation. The Didache assumes that Christian identity must become visible in practice. A community cannot claim to walk in the Way of Life while embodying the characteristics of the Way of Death.

His emphasis on enemy-love also has strong textual support. The commands to bless persecutors, pray for enemies, turn away from retaliation, and give to those who ask belong to the moral core of the document. Tolstoy did not invent the radicalism of these demands. He took seriously language that later Christian societies often softened through exceptions.

The same is true of his concern with wealth, speech, and the treatment of vulnerable persons. The Didache condemns greed, hypocrisy, arrogance, and indifference to the poor. Tolstoy's critique of luxury, exploitation, and social privilege therefore belongs in genuine continuity with early Christian moral teaching.

He also shared the Didache's insistence that religious authority must be tested by conduct. Prophets and teachers are not authenticated merely by claims to spiritual status. Their behavior reveals whether they are trustworthy. Tolstoy's judgment of clergy according to their participation in violence, wealth, and political power extends this ancient principle into a modern institutional setting.

11.2 Strategic Omissions and Reinterpretations

The difficulty arises from Tolstoy's tendency to treat the ethical portions of the Didache as original and essential while regarding its ritual, ecclesial, and apocalyptic elements as secondary. The document itself does not clearly support this hierarchy. Moral instruction leads into baptism, fasting, fixed prayer, Eucharistic thanksgiving, communal discipline, recognized ministry, and expectation of the Lord's coming.

Tolstoy could preserve these elements only by reinterpreting them according to his rational moral framework. Baptism became primarily a sign of commitment. Prayer became the inward recollection of moral truth. Eucharistic thanksgiving could be valued as fellowship while sacramental claims were rejected. Resurrection and judgment were translated into spiritual or ethical categories.

Such reinterpretations allowed the text to remain useful, but they weakened its capacity to challenge Tolstoy's prior conclusions. The Didache was accepted where it confirmed his account of Christianity and explained away where it did not.

This selectivity is most visible in his treatment of Christ. The Didache does not contain later conciliar definitions, but Jesus belongs within the community's prayer, baptism, thanksgiving, authority, and hope. Tolstoy emphasized Jesus as teacher while minimizing the religious devotion directed through him and the expectation of his coming.

His method therefore retrieved one dimension of primitive Christianity by narrowing the others. Ethical practice was detached from the larger narrative of divine action, communal worship, and eschatological fulfillment.

11.3 The Danger of Reducing Christianity to Ethics

Tolstoy's theology raises the possibility that Christianity can be reduced to a universal moral teaching. The advantage of such a reduction is clarity. Love, nonviolence, generosity, and truthfulness can be presented as immediately relevant to every person, regardless of doctrinal education or institutional affiliation.

The danger is that Christian ethics may lose the theological sources that give it its distinctive meaning and sustaining power. In early Christianity, enemy-love was not merely a rational

principle. It was connected with the character of God, the teaching and suffering of Jesus, the work of the Spirit, the formation of a new community, and hope in resurrection and judgment.

The commands were radical precisely because believers understood themselves as participating in a divine reality not created by their own moral effort. Worship, prayer, baptism, and Eucharist were not necessarily substitutes for obedience. They could be practices through which a community learned and sustained obedience.

Tolstoy rightly exposed the opposite danger: doctrine and ritual can become means of avoiding ethical transformation. Yet his reaction sometimes implied that moral truth becomes purer when separated from theology. The Didache suggests instead that primitive Christianity joined confession, worship, discipline, and conduct within a single form of life.

11.4 The Prophetic Strength of Tolstoy's Critique

Tolstoy's greatest theological strength lies in his refusal to allow Christianity to evade its own moral claims. He exposed the contradiction between enemy-love and warfare, between simplicity and luxury, between truthfulness and political propaganda, between mercy and punitive violence, and between the universality of God's law and the divisions created by nationalism.

His critique remains especially powerful because it was directed not only at individual hypocrisy but at institutions. Churches could preach charity while benefiting from social inequality. They could honor martyrs while supporting governments that imprisoned conscientious objectors. They could proclaim the sanctity of life while blessing military power and capital punishment.

Tolstoy forced Christian theology to confront practices that had become normal through long accommodation. He asked whether historical acceptance could make conduct Christian when it contradicted the plain direction of Jesus' teaching.

His prophetic force also arose from personal consistency. He did not merely propose reforms for others. He struggled to simplify his own life, rejected literary ownership in certain forms, opposed state violence, defended persecuted dissenters, and accepted public hostility for his conclusions. His practice was imperfect, but his theology was not merely rhetorical.

11.5 The Theological Limits of Moral Rationalism

Tolstoy's moral rationalism supplied a powerful criterion of judgment, but it also restricted the range of religious truth. He assumed that genuine revelation must be universally intelligible to reason and conscience. Teachings that appeared miraculous, metaphysical, sacramental, or apocalyptic were therefore placed under suspicion.

This approach protected religion from superstition and authoritarian manipulation. It also made Tolstoy's own understanding of reason the final standard of revelation. God could reveal only what corresponded to the moral structure Tolstoy already recognized.

The result was a theology with little room for divine mystery, historical particularity, or realities that exceed immediate moral comprehension. The incarnation, resurrection, sacrament, and grace were not merely interpreted differently; they were often excluded because they did not fit the prior definition of rational religion.

Moral rationalism also struggled to explain the depth of human failure. Tolstoy described the way of love clearly, but he offered a less developed account of why human beings repeatedly reject it and how they receive power to live otherwise. His theology demanded transformation while leaving grace comparatively undefined.

11.6 Tolstoy as Translator, Reformer, and Modern Church Father

Tolstoy's role cannot be captured adequately by the labels of novelist, heretic, or moral philosopher. In his engagement with the Didache, he acted as translator, editor, interpreter, and reformer. He retrieved an ancient Christian text and placed it before a modern audience as a challenge to established religion.

In this limited sense, he performed a function analogous to that of a church father. He interpreted inherited sources, judged the church of his age, and proposed a comprehensive vision of Christian life. Yet he did so from outside ecclesiastical communion and against many of the doctrines that historically defined the church.

The description of Tolstoy as a modern church father is therefore paradoxical but illuminating. He possessed the moral seriousness, exegetical ambition, and reforming purpose associated with major Christian teachers. At the same time, his theology dissolved much of the doctrinal structure those teachers sought to defend.

His significance may lie precisely in this unstable position. He stood close enough to Christianity to expose its betrayals and far enough from orthodoxy to question assumptions protected by tradition.

11.7 The Unresolved Paradox

Tolstoy appealed to primitive Christianity as an authority against the institutional church, yet the primitive sources themselves testify to forms of church, worship, sacrament, and theological confession that he resisted. He recovered the Way of Life while narrowing the world in which that way was practiced.

This is the unresolved paradox of his project. Tolstoy was most faithful to primitive Christianity when he demanded that its commands be obeyed. He was least faithful when he treated its theological and communal structures as dispensable coverings around an ethical core.

His reconstruction nevertheless retains enduring value. It reveals truths that ecclesiastical Christianity can obscure, even when it does not provide a complete account of the faith. Tolstoy does not permit the church to appeal to doctrine as an excuse for violence or to sacrament as a substitute for repentance. The Didache does not permit Tolstoy to claim that Christianity was ever merely a private moral philosophy.

A balanced assessment must therefore hold both judgments together. Tolstoy's retrieval was selective, but the church's reception of Jesus had also often been selective. He emphasized commands that Christians had neglected, while neglecting beliefs and practices that early Christians regarded as inseparable from those commands.

His lasting importance lies not in resolving this tension but in making it impossible to ignore. He asks the church whether it can remain Christian without obeying Christ. The Didache asks Tolstoy whether obedience to Christ can remain fully Christian when detached from the worshiping community, divine grace, resurrection hope, and the confession of Jesus as Lord.

12. Conclusion: Tolstoy's Didache and the Future of Christian Witness

Tolstoy's engagement with the Didache reveals a religious project more historically grounded and theologically complex than the familiar image of him as a moralist who simply discarded Christianity's supernatural elements. He did not merely extract ethical sayings from the Gospels and oppose them to the church. He turned to one of the earliest surviving Christian manuals in order to test his conviction that authentic Christianity was originally a disciplined way of life centered on love, truthfulness, generosity, nonviolence, and freedom from domination.

The Didache appeared to confirm much of Tolstoy's reconstruction. Its opening contrast between the Way of Life and the Way of Death placed conduct at the entrance to Christian existence. Its commands concerning enemies, possessions, anger, sexuality, speech, and care for the poor supported his insistence that faith must become visible in ordinary life. Its testing of religious leaders by their conduct reinforced his challenge to churches that claimed authority while accommodating themselves to wealth, nationalism, punishment, and war.

Yet the same document also exposed the incompleteness of his recovery. Primitive Christianity was not merely an ethical philosophy. The Didache portrays a community that baptized, fasted, prayed, shared sacred thanksgiving, recognized ministers, disciplined members, awaited

judgment, and expected the coming of the Lord. Tolstoy recovered the radical moral demands of this world while resisting much of the theological and ecclesial structure that sustained them.

12.1 Summary of the Central Argument

The central argument of this study has been that Tolstoy appropriated the Didache selectively but not arbitrarily. His interpretation emerged from genuine continuities between the ancient text and his own reading of Jesus. Both emphasized that religious truth must be practiced. Both treated moral life as a choice between opposed ways. Both refused to separate love of God from treatment of neighbors, enemies, strangers, and the poor.

Tolstoy used these continuities to construct a powerful critique of Christian civilization. If the earliest Christian teaching commanded enemy-love and nonretaliation, then churches could not bless warfare without contradiction. If discipleship required generosity and simplicity, then ecclesiastical wealth and social privilege required moral examination. If truthfulness belonged to the Way of Life, then political oaths, propaganda, and institutional deception could not be treated as religiously neutral.

His retrieval became selective when he treated the ethical material as the true essence of Christianity and the ritual, doctrinal, and eschatological material as secondary. The Didache itself does not make this separation. It joins moral instruction to communal worship, initiation, leadership, and hope. Tolstoy's version of primitive Christianity was therefore a real recovery of neglected truths but not a complete reconstruction of the ancient faith.

12.2 Reassessment of Tolstoy's Theology

Tolstoy should not be classified simply as a secular ethical thinker who borrowed the language of Christianity. His theology was rooted in a profound search for meaning before death, a sustained engagement with the teaching of Jesus, and a serious attempt to live according to the law of love. God, eternal life, repentance, and the Kingdom of God remained essential to his thought, even though he interpreted them outside the doctrinal framework of historic Christianity.

At the same time, he cannot be placed comfortably within Orthodox, Catholic, or Protestant theology. He rejected the Trinity, the incarnation, sacrificial atonement, bodily resurrection, sacramental grace, and authoritative ecclesial tradition. Jesus was principally the revealer and embodiment of the divine law rather than the eternal Son through whom God reconciled and renewed creation.

Tolstoy's theology is therefore best understood as a radical Christian reconstruction. It retained the ethical authority of Jesus while revising the meaning of revelation, salvation, church, and eternal life. Its strength lay in the unity it demanded between belief and conduct. Its weakness

lay in reducing the gospel so extensively to moral teaching that the role of grace, worship, divine action, and communal formation became difficult to explain.

12.3 Contributions to Tolstoy Studies and Early Christian Studies

Attention to Tolstoy's adaptation of the Didache enriches the interpretation of his religious thought. It demonstrates that his appeal to primitive Christianity was not only rhetorical. He actively engaged an ancient source, revised it for a broader audience, and incorporated it into his campaign for religious reform.

This engagement also clarifies his method. Tolstoy did not accept a text simply because it was ancient or associated with apostolic tradition. He judged it through reason and conscience. Passages that supported practical obedience received primary emphasis, while ritual and supernatural elements were simplified or reinterpreted. His work with the Didache therefore provides a concentrated example of his larger approach to Scripture and tradition.

For early Christian studies, Tolstoy's reception of the document illustrates how ancient texts acquire new meanings in modern controversies. The Didache became not only evidence about early baptism, Eucharist, ministry, and ethics, but also a weapon in a struggle over the meaning of Christianity in modern society. Tolstoy's use of it reminds scholars that reception history is not merely the record of interpretation. It is the history of how texts are used to challenge institutions, authorize reforms, and redefine religious identity.

12.4 The Challenge to Contemporary Christianity

Tolstoy's central questions remain unresolved. Can a church proclaim love of enemies while supporting military violence? Can it preach mercy while defending punitive systems organized around retribution? Can it celebrate the poor while accumulating wealth and aligning itself with political privilege? Can it confess Christ truthfully while treating his most difficult commands as impractical?

These questions cannot be dismissed by pointing to the deficiencies of Tolstoy's Christology. His rejection of historic doctrine does not invalidate his moral criticism. A church may answer him theologically and still fail to answer him ethically.

The Didache intensifies the challenge because it shows that rigorous moral discipleship was not a late invention or an optional reforming emphasis. It stood near the beginning of Christian communal identity. Baptism, prayer, Eucharistic thanksgiving, and ministry were joined to a demanding Way of Life. Worship without obedience would therefore represent not merely a modern failure but a contradiction of the early pattern itself.

Contemporary Christianity may need to recover the unity that both Tolstoy and institutional religion divided. Tolstoy preserved obedience while diminishing sacrament and doctrine.

Churches have sometimes preserved sacrament and doctrine while weakening obedience. The Didache suggests that the ancient Christian vision required all of these elements to remain connected.

12.5 Final Judgment

Tolstoy should be judged as both a prophetic critic and a selective reformer. He saw with exceptional clarity that Christianity loses moral credibility when it blesses the forms of violence, domination, falsehood, and privilege that Jesus opposed. His doctrine of nonresistance compelled believers to examine practices that had become acceptable through custom and political necessity.

Yet his reconstruction of Christianity remained incomplete. By defining the essence of faith primarily as rational moral obedience, he left insufficient room for the mystery of God, the identity of Christ, the work of grace, the sacramental community, bodily resurrection, and divine fulfillment of history. He recovered the path but narrowed the story within which early Christians believed that path could be walked.

The enduring value of his encounter with the Didache lies in the tension it exposes. Tolstoy asks whether Christian doctrine has become a means of avoiding discipleship. The Didache asks whether discipleship can be separated from worship, community, hope, and confession. Neither question should be answered by silencing the other.

Tolstoy's religious legacy therefore remains both disturbing and fruitful. He cannot provide a complete account of primitive Christianity, but he makes complacent Christianity difficult to defend. He reminds the church that fidelity is measured not only by what it preserves, teaches, and celebrates, but also by the kind of life it forms. The final significance of his theology may rest in this uncompromising demand: Christianity must become visible in the treatment of enemies, the use of power, the possession of wealth, the practice of truth, and the willingness to suffer rather than inflict suffering.

13. References

13.1 Primary Works by Leo Tolstoy

Tolstoy, Leo. *A Confession and What I Believe*. Translated with an introduction by Aylmer Maude. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1921.

Tolstoy, Leo. *A Confession and Other Religious Writings*. Translated with an introduction by Jane Kentish. London: Penguin Books, 1987.

Tolstoy, Leo. "Bethink Yourselves!" In *Essays and Letters*, translated by Aylmer Maude. London: Oxford University Press, 1911.

Tolstoy, Leo. *The Gospel in Brief*. Translated by Dustin Condren. New York: Harper Perennial, 2011.

Tolstoy, Leo. *The Kingdom of God Is Within You: Christianity Not as a Mystical Doctrine but as a New Understanding of Life*. Translated by Constance Garnett. Foreword by Martin Green. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984. Originally published in English in 1894.

Tolstoy, Leo. "My Reply to the Synod." In *A Confession and Other Religious Writings*, translated by Jane Kentish. London: Penguin Books, 1987.

Tolstoy, Leo. *My Religion*. Translated by Huntington Smith. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1885.

Tolstoy, Leo. *The Slavery of Our Times*. Translated by Aylmer Maude. London: Free Age Press, 1900.

Tolstoy, Leo. "Учение 12-ти апостолов" [The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles]. In *Полное собрание сочинений* [Complete Collected Works], vol. 25, 416–428. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia Literatura, 1937.

Tolstoy, Leo. "В чем моя вера?" [What I Believe]. In *Полное собрание сочинений* [Complete Collected Works], vol. 23. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia Literatura, 1957.

Tolstoy, Leo. *What Then Must We Do?* Translated by Aylmer Maude. London: Oxford University Press, 1925.

Tolstoy, Leo. "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." Tolstoy.ru. Accessed June 13, 2026. https://tolstoy.ru/creativity/journalismguide/104.php.

Tolstoy, Leo. "What I Believe." Tolstoy.ru. Accessed June 13, 2026. https://tolstoy.ru/creativity/journalismguide/86.php.

13.2 Texts, Translations, and Editions of the Didache

Bryennios, Philotheos. *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων* [The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles]. Constantinople, 1883.

Ehrman, Bart D., trans. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Vol. 1. Loeb Classical Library 24. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Holmes, Michael W., ed. and trans. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.

Lake, Kirsopp, trans. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Vol. 1. Loeb Classical Library 24. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1912.

Popov, Konstantin D. "Учение двенадцати апостолов: Новооткрытый памятник древнехристианской письменности" [The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles: A Newly Discovered Monument of Early Christian Literature]. *Труды Киевской духовной академии* 3, no. 11 (1884): 344–384.

Rordorf, Willy, and André Tuilier, eds. and trans. *La Doctrine des douze Apôtres: Didachè*. Sources Chrétiennes 248. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1978.

13.3 Scholarship on the Didache and Primitive Christianity

Alikin, Valeriy A. *The Earliest History of the Christian Gathering: Origin, Development and Content of the Christian Gathering in the First to Third Centuries*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Draper, Jonathan A., ed. *The Didache in Modern Research*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Foster, Paul, ed. *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers*. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

Jefford, Clayton N. *The Didache: The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013.

Jefford, Clayton N. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 11. Leiden: Brill, 1989.

Milavec, Aaron. *The Didache: Faith, Hope, and Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* New York: Newman Press, 2003.

Milavec, Aaron. *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003.

Niederwimmer, Kurt. *The Didache: A Commentary*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Edited by Harold W. Attridge. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.

O'Loughlin, Thomas. *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010.

Stewart-Sykes, Alistair. *The Original Bishops: Office and Order in the First Christian Communities*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014.

Van de Sandt, Huub, and David Flusser. *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 3.5. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

Varner, William. "The Didache's Use of the Old and New Testaments." *Master's Seminary Journal* 16, no. 1 (2005): 127–151.

13.4 Scholarship on Tolstoy's Religion and Theology

Bartlett, Rosamund. *Tolstoy: A Russian Life*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2011.

Berman, Anna A., ed. *Tolstoy in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023.

Gustafson, Richard F. *Leo Tolstoy: Resident and Stranger—A Study in Fiction and Theology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Hamburg, G. M. "Tolstoy's Spirituality." In *The Cambridge Companion to Tolstoy*, edited by Donna Tussing Orwin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

McLean, Hugh. *In Quest of Tolstoy*. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2008.

Medzhibovskaya, Inessa. *Tolstoy and the Religious Culture of His Time: A Biography of a Long Conversion, 1845–1887*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2008.

Orwin, Donna Tussing, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Tolstoy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Paperno, Irina. *"Who, What Am I?": Tolstoy Struggles to Narrate the Self*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2014.

Rancour-Laferriere, Daniel. *Tolstoy's Quest for God*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2007.

Simmons, Ernest J. *Leo Tolstoy*. 2 vols. Boston: Little, Brown, 1946.

Zernov, Nicolas. *The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century*. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

13.5 Tolstoyan Nonviolence, Christian Anarchism, and Social Thought

Alston, Charlotte. *Tolstoy and His Disciples: The History of a Radical International Movement*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2014.

Brock, Peter. *Pacifism in Europe to 1914*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972.

Christoyannopoulos, Alexandre. *Christian Anarchism: A Political Commentary on the Gospel*. Exeter: Imprint Academic, 2010.

Christoyannopoulos, Alexandre. "Leo Tolstoy on the State: A Detailed Picture of Tolstoy's Denunciation of State Violence and Deception." *Anarchist Studies* 16, no. 1 (2008): 20–47.

Christoyannopoulos, Alexandre. "Leo Tolstoy's Anticlericalism in Its Context and Beyond: A Case against Churches and Clerics, Religious and Secular." *Religions* 7, no. 5 (2016): 59. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel7050059.

Christoyannopoulos, Alexandre. *Tolstoy's Political Thought: Christian Anarcho-Pacifist Iconoclasm Then and Now*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2020.

Christoyannopoulos, Alexandre. "Turning the Other Cheek to Terrorism: Reflections on the Contemporary Significance of Leo Tolstoy's Exegesis of the Sermon on the Mount." *Politics and Religion* 1, no. 1 (2008): 27–54. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755048308000035.

Edgerton, William B., ed. *Memoirs of Peasant Tolstoyans in Soviet Russia*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.

Green, Martin. *The Origins of Nonviolence: Tolstoy and Gandhi in Their Historical Settings*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1986.

Higgs, Robert. "Tolstoy's Manifesto on the State, Christian Anarchy, and Pacifism." *Independent Review* 19, no. 3 (2015): 471–479.

Wink, Walter. *Engaging the Powers: Discernment and Resistance in a World of Domination*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Yoder, John Howard. *The Politics of Jesus*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994.

The author has published over 5,500 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.